arXiv:1411.5562v1 [math.AP] 20 Nov 2014

# Solution regularity and smooth dependence for abstract equations and applications to hyperbolic PDEs

I. Kmit L. Recke

Institute of Mathematics, Humboldt University of Berlin,

Rudower Chaussee 25, D-12489 Berlin, Germany

and Institute for Applied Problems of Mechanics and Mathematics,

Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Naukova St. 3b, 79060 Lviv, Ukraine

E-mail: kmit@informatik.hu-berlin.de

Institute of Mathematics, Humboldt University of Berlin,

Rudower Chaussee 25, D-12489 Berlin, Germany

E-mail: recke@mathematik.hu-berlin.de

**Abstract**

In the first part we present a generalized implicit function theorem for abstract equations of the type $F(\lambda, u) = 0$. We suppose that $u_0$ is a solution for $\lambda = 0$ and that $F(\lambda, \cdot)$ is smooth for all $\lambda$, but, mainly, we do not suppose that $F(\cdot, u)$ is smooth for all $u$. Even so, we state conditions such that for all $\lambda \approx 0$ there exists exactly one solution $u \approx u_0$, that $u$ is smooth in a certain abstract sense, and that the data-to-solution map $\lambda \mapsto u$ is smooth.

In the second part we apply the results of the first part to time-periodic solutions of first-order hyperbolic systems of the type

$$\partial_t u_j + a_j(x, \lambda)\partial_x u_j + b_j(t, x, \lambda, u) = 0,\ x \in (0, 1),\ j = 1, \dots, n$$

with reflection boundary conditions and of second-order hyperbolic equations of the type

$$\partial_t^2 u - a(x, \lambda)^2 \partial_x^2 u + b(t, x, \lambda, u, \partial_t u, \partial_x u) = 0,\ x \in (0, 1)$$

with mixed boundary conditions (one Dirichlet and one Neumann). There are at least two distinguishing features of these results in comparison with the corresponding ones for parabolic PDEs: First, one has to prevent small divisors from coming up, and we present explicit sufficient conditions for that in terms of $u_0$ and of the data of the PDEs and of the boundary conditions. And second, in general smooth dependence of the coefficient functions $b_j$ and $b$ on $t$ is needed in order to get smooth dependence of the solution on $\lambda$, this is completely different to what is known for parabolic PDEs.

*Key words:* generalized implicit function theorem, nonlinear first-order and second-order hyperbolic PDEs, boundary value problems, time-periodic solutions

# 1 Introduction

In the first part of this paper we consider abstract parameter depending equations of the type

$$F(\lambda, u) = 0. \tag{1.1}$$

We suppose $F(0, u_0) = 0$ and state conditions on $F$ and $u_0$ such that for all $\lambda \approx 0$ there exists exactly one solution $u \approx u_0$ to (1.1) and that the data-to-solution map $\lambda \mapsto u$ is smooth. Two conditions for that are, similar to classical implicit function theorems, that $F(\lambda, \cdot)$ is smooth for all $\lambda \approx 0$ and that $\partial_u F(0, u_0)$ is an isomorphism. But, mainly, we do not suppose that $F(\cdot, u)$ is smooth for all $u \approx u_0$. In our applications to hyperbolic PDEs the map $(\lambda, u) \mapsto \partial_u F(\lambda, u)$ is even not continuous with respect to the uniform operator norm, in general. In other words: We consider parameter depending equations, which do not depend smoothly on the parameter, but with solutions which do depend smoothly on the parameter. For that, of course, some additional structure is needed, which will be described in Section 2.

Moreover, we prove an abstract solution regularity result for the equation (1.1) of the following kind: Let

$$\ldots \hookrightarrow U_{l+1} \hookrightarrow U_l \hookrightarrow \ldots \hookrightarrow U_1 \hookrightarrow U_0$$

be a sequence of Banach spaces continuously embedded into each other. Suppose that $F$ maps $\mathbb{R} \times U_0$ into $U_0$ and satisfies some weak smoothness condition with respect to $\lambda$ (see (2.4)) and some strong smoothness condition with respect to $u$ (see (2.3)). Then for all solutions $(\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times U_0$ to (1.1), which are close to $(0, u_0)$, it holds $u \in U_l$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and the data-to-solution map $\lambda \mapsto u \in U_l$ is smooth for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$.

In the second part we apply the abstract results of the first part to semilinear first-order hyperbolic systems of the type

$$\partial_t u_j + a_j(x, \lambda)\partial_x u_j + b_j(t, x, \lambda, u) = 0,\ x \in (0, 1),\ j = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{1.2}$$

with periodicity conditions in time

$$u_j(t + 2\pi, x) = u_j(t, x),\ x \in (0, 1),\ j = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{1.3}$$

and reflection boundary conditions in space

$$\begin{aligned} u_j(t, 0) &= \sum_{k=m+1}^{n} r_{jk}(t, \lambda) u_k(t, 0),\ j = 1, \ldots, m, \\ u_j(t, 1) &= \sum_{k=1}^{m} r_{jk}(t, \lambda) u_k(t, 1),\ j = m + 1, \ldots, n, \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

(or, more generally, with the boundary conditions (3.36)) as well as to semilinear second-order hyperbolic equations of the type

$$\partial_t^2 u - a(x,\lambda)^2 \partial_x^2 u + b(t,x,\lambda,u,\partial_t u,\partial_x u) = 0,\ x \in (0,1) \tag{1.5}$$

with periodicity condition in time

$$u(t+2\pi,x) = u(t,x),\ x \in (0,1) \tag{1.6}$$

and boundary conditions in space

$$u(t,0) = \partial_x u(t,1) = 0. \tag{1.7}$$

We suppose that for $\lambda = 0$ there exists a classical solution $u_0$ to (1.2)–(1.4) (respectively, to (1.5)–(1.7)). We state conditions on $u_0$ and on the data of (1.2)–(1.4) (respectively, of (1.5)–(1.7)) such that for all $\lambda \approx 0$ there exists exactly one solution $u \approx u_0$ to (1.2)–(1.4) (respectively, to (1.5)–(1.7)), that this solution is smooth (with respect to $t$ and $x$) and that the data-to-solution map $\lambda \mapsto u$ is smooth (in any $C^k$-norm).

We do not assume that the time-periodic solution $u_0$ is close to be time-independent. Moreover, we do not assume that $u_0$ is $C^\infty$-smooth with respect to $t$ and $x$, but we prove that it is $C^\infty$-smooth (under reasonable assumptions, cf. Theorems 3.1 and 4.1). Remark also that the initial-boundary value problems, corresponding to (1.2), (1.4) (respectively, to (1.5),(1.7)), do not have a smoothing property (for $t > t_0$ the solution $u(t,\cdot)$ is not smoother than the initial function $u(t_0,\cdot)$), in general. In fact, all our results concerning the periodic-boundary value problems (1.2)–(1.4) and (1.5)–(1.7) will be proven without using any properties of the corresponding initial-boundary value problems.

For smoothness of the data-to-solution map, for example, with respect to the $L^\infty$-norm, we need not only smoothness of the coefficient functions with respect to $\lambda$, $u$, $\partial_t u$ and $\partial_x u$, but also smoothness with respect to $t$ (cf. Remark 3.2). This is completely different to what is known for elliptic and parabolic PDEs, where the data-to-solution map may be smooth with respect to the $L^\infty$-norm even if the coefficient functions are discontinuous in time and/or space variables (see [12, 13]).

Also, we have to assume the conditions (3.4) (or (3.5) in the case $m = 1, n = 2$) for (1.2)–(1.4) and (4.3) for (1.5)–(1.7) which do not have an analog in corresponding parabolic problems. For example, for (1.2)–(1.4) with $m = 1$, $n = 2$, $r_{jk}(t,0) = r_{jk}$ and $b_j(t,x,0,u) = b_{j1}(x)u_1 + b_{j2}(x)u_1 + f_j(t,x)$ the condition reads

$$|r_{12}r_{21}| \exp \int_0^1 \left( \frac{b_{11}(x)}{a_1(x,0)} - \frac{b_{22}(x)}{a_2(x,0)} \right) dx \neq 1.$$

In [18] it is shown that this is a kind of a nonresonance condition which prevents small divisors from coming up in the Fourier series for the solution components $u_j$. For (1.5)–(1.7) with $b(t,x,0,u,\partial_t u,\partial_x u) = a_1(x)\partial_t u + a_2(x)\partial_x u + b_0(t,x,u)$ the nonresonance condition reads

$$\int_0^1 \frac{a_1(x)}{a(x,0)}\, dx \neq 0.$$

**Remark 1.1** Unfortunately we do not know if generalizations of our results to cases with higher space dimensions and/or to quasilinear equations exist and how they should look like. On the other hand, generalization of our results to cases of a multidimensional control parameter $\lambda$ is straightforward (cf. [20] and Remark 2.4).

**Remark 1.2** (i) If the coefficients $a_j$ in (1.2)–(1.4) (respectively, $a$ in (1.5)–(1.7)) depend on $t$, then the question of smoothness of the data-to-solution map seems to be much more difficult (cf. Remark 3.6). This is again quite different to what is known for parabolic PDEs.

(ii) In the particular case, if the coefficients $a_j$ (resp. $a$) do not depend on $\lambda$ and if the coefficients $b_j$ (resp. $b$) are not independent on $t$, the proof of the smoothness of the data-to-solution map is much simpler and can be done by means of the classical implicit function theorem, cf. Remarks 3.5 and 4.4.

Our paper is organized as follows:

In Section 2 we formulate and prove a generalized implicit function theorem. Here we use, among other technical tools, the converse to Taylor's theorem and the fiber contraction principle. Section 3 presents our results concerning regularity and smooth dependence of solutions to (1.2)–(1.4), using integration along characteristics as well as the results of Section 2. Similar results for the second-order hyperbolic problem (1.5)–(1.7) are obtained in Section 4. Finally, in A we present a simple linear version of the fiber contraction principle, while in A we develop an abstract approach how to verify the key assumptions (2.8) and (2.9) of the generalized implicit function theorem.

# 2 A generalized implicit function theorem

## 2.1 Setting and main result

In this section we consider abstract parameter depending equations of the type (1.1). Suppose that

$$F(0, u_0) = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

We are going to state conditions on $F$ and $u_0$ such that for all $\lambda \approx 0$ there exists exactly one solution $u \approx u_0$ to (1.1), that the solutions $u$ are smooth (in a way defined below) and smoothly depend on $\lambda$. One condition for that is that $F(\lambda, \cdot)$ is smooth and that $\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)$ is an isomorphism for all $\lambda \approx 0$. But, mainly, we do not suppose that $F(\cdot, u)$ is smooth for all $u \approx u_0$. In particular, we do not suppose that $\partial_u F$ is continuous, hence, in general, the condition $\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0) \in \mathrm{Iso}$ for all $\lambda \approx 0$ does not follow from the condition $\partial_u F(0, u_0) \in \mathrm{Iso}$ of the classical implicit function theorem (see Remark 3.8).

In other words, we are going to describe parameter depending equations, which do not depend smoothly on the parameter, but with solutions which do depend smoothly on the parameter. For that, of course, some additional structure is needed, which will be described now.

Let $U_0$ be a Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|_0$, and let $T(s) \in \mathcal{L}(U_0), s \in \mathbb{R}$, be a strongly continuous group of linear bounded operators on $U_0$. Denote by $A : D(A) \subseteq U_0 \to U_0$ the infinitesimal generator of $T(s)$ and by

$$U_l := D(A^l) = \{u \in U_0 : T(\cdot)u \in C^l(\mathbb{R}; U_0)\}$$

the domain of definition of the $l$-th power of $A$. Because of $A$ is closed, $U_l$ is a Banach space with the norm

$$\|u\|_l := \sum_{k=0}^{l} \|A^k u\|_0.$$

Further, let $u_0 \in U_0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be given. Let $F : [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times U_0 \to U_0$ be a map satisfying (2.1). Consider the map $\mathcal{F} : [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times \mathbb{R} \times U_0 \to U_0$ defined by

$$\mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, u) := T(s)F(\lambda, T(-s)u). \tag{2.2}$$

Suppose that

$$\mathcal{F}(\lambda, \cdot, \cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times U_0; U_0) \text{ for all } \lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0], \tag{2.3}$$

and denote by $\partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, u)$ the corresponding partial derivatives, i.e. bounded multilinear maps from $U_0^j := U_0 \times \ldots \times U_0$ ($j$ factors) into $U_0$. Further, we suppose that for all nonnegative integers $j, k$ and $l$

$$\partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\cdot, 0, u)(u_1, \ldots, u_j) \in C^l([-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]; U_0) \text{ for all } u, u_1, \ldots, u_j \in U_l. \tag{2.4}$$

Finally, for $u, u_1, \ldots, u_j \in U_l$ denote by $\partial_\lambda^l \partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, u)(u_1, \ldots, u_j) \in U_0$ the derivative of order $l$ of the map $\partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\cdot, 0, u)(u_1, \ldots, u_j)$. Suppose that for all nonnegative integers $j, k, l$ there exists $c_{jkl} > 0$ such that for all $u, u_1, \ldots, u_j \in U_l$ with $\|u - u_0\|_l \leq 1$ and for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ it holds

$$\|\partial_\lambda^l \partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\lambda, 0, u)(u_1, \ldots, u_j)\|_0 \leq c_{jkl} \|u_1\|_l \ldots \|u_j\|_l. \tag{2.5}$$

**Remark 2.1** The notation $\partial_\lambda^l \partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, u)(u_1, \ldots, u_j)$ should be used with some care: By definition,

$$\partial_\lambda^l \partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, u)(u_1, \ldots, u_j) := \frac{d^l}{d\mu^l} \left[\partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\lambda + \mu, s, u)(u_1, \ldots, u_j)\right]_{\mu=0} \tag{2.6}$$

for given $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0], s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u, u_1, \ldots, u_j \in U_l$, where the derivatives in the right-hand side of (2.6) exist in the sense of the norm $\|\cdot\|_0$ in $U_0$ because of assumption (2.4). From the other side, assumption (2.5) claims that for given $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0], s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in U_l$ the symmetric multilinear map $(u_1, \ldots, u_j) \in U_l^j \mapsto \partial_\lambda^l \partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, u)(u_1, \ldots, u_j) \in U_0$ is bounded, hence it is reasonable to denote it by

$$\partial_\lambda^l \partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, u) := \partial_\lambda^l \partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, u)(\cdot, \ldots, \cdot) \in \mathcal{S}_j(U_l; U_0).$$

Here and in what follows we denote by $\mathcal{S}_j(U_l; U_0)$ the vector space of all bounded symmetric multilinear maps from $U_l^j$ to $U_0$ with the usual uniform operator norm

$$\|A\|_{\mathcal{S}_j(U_l;U_0)} := \sup\{\|A(u_1, \ldots, u_j)\|_0 : \ \|u_1\|_l \leq 1, \ldots, \|u_j\|_l \leq 1\}.$$

For example, in general $\partial_\lambda \partial_u \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, u)$ is not the limit with respect to the uniform operator norm in $\mathcal{L}(U_0)$ of the differential quotient $(\partial_u \mathcal{F}(\lambda+\mu, s, u) - \partial_u \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, u))/\mu$ for $\mu \to 0$.

We proceed similarly with $F(\lambda, u) = \mathcal{F}(\lambda, 0, u)$: Given $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $u, u_1, \dots, u_j \in U_l$, denote

$$\partial_\lambda^l \partial_u^j F(\lambda, u)(u_1, \dots, u_j) := \frac{d^l}{d\mu^l} \left[\partial_u^j F(\lambda+\mu, u)(u_1, \dots, u_j)\right]_{\mu=0}. \tag{2.7}$$

Because of (2.5) we have

$$\partial_\lambda^l \partial_u^j F(\lambda, u) := \partial_\lambda^l \partial_u^j F(\lambda, u)(\cdot, \dots, \cdot) \in \mathcal{S}_j\left(U_l; U_0\right).$$

We do not suppose that $F(\cdot, u) : [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \to U_0$ is differentiable for all $u \in U_0$ or that $\partial_u F : [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times U_0 \to \mathcal{L}(U_0)$ is continuous (with respect to the uniform operator norm in $\mathcal{L}(U_0)$), and in the hyperbolic problems discussed in Sections 3 and 4 this is indeed not the case. But later on (see Lemma 2.9) we will show that under the assumptions (2.3)-(2.5) the map $F$ is $C^m$-smooth from $[-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times U_{l+m}$ to $U_l$ for all $l$ and $m$.

The main result of this section is the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.2** *Suppose (2.1) and (2.3)–(2.5). Assume that there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$*

$$\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0) \text{ is Fredholm of index zero from } U_0 \text{ to } U_0 \tag{2.8}$$

*and*

$$\|\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0) u\|_0 \geq c_0 \|u\|_0 \text{ for all } u \in U_0. \tag{2.9}$$

*Then there exist $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $\delta > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$ there exists a unique solution $u = \hat{u}(\lambda)$ to (1.1) with $\|u - u_0\|_0 \leq \delta$. Moreover, for all nonnegative integers $k$ we have $\hat{u}(\lambda) \in U_k$, and the map $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \mapsto \hat{u}(\lambda) \in U_k$ is $C^\infty$-smooth.*

**Remark 2.3** The assumptions (2.8) and (2.9) imply that the operators $\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)$ are isomorphisms on $U_0$. Hence, the difference between Theorem 2.2 and the classical implicit function theorem is not a degeneracy of the partial derivatives $\partial_u F(\lambda, u)$ (like in implicit function theorems of Nash-Moser type), but a degeneracy of the partial derivatives $\partial_\lambda F(\lambda, u)$ (which do not exist for all $u \in U_0$, in general). There exist several generalizations of the classical implicit function theorem in which the partial derivatives $\partial_\lambda F(\lambda, u)$ do not exist for all $u$ or in which the partial derivatives $\partial_u F(\lambda, u)$ are not continuous with respect to $(\lambda, u)$, see, e.g., [4, Theorem 7], [10, Theorem 3.4], [11, Theorem 4.1], [32, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2]. However, it turns out that they do not fit to our applications, so we are going to adapt ideas of [22], [26] and [31, Theorem 2.1].

**Remark 2.4** We assume that the control parameter $\lambda$ is one-dimensional, what makes the presentation simpler. But Theorem 2.2 can be generalized in a straightforward way to the case of maps $F : \Lambda_0 \times U_0 \mapsto U_0$ where $\Lambda_0$ is a neighborhood of zero in a normed vector space $\Lambda$. In this case $\partial_\lambda^l \partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, u)$ is not a multilinear map from $U_0^j$ to $U_0$ anymore, but a multilinear map from $\Lambda^l \times U_0^j$ to $U_0$, and the assumption (2.5) has to be changed to

$$\|\partial_\lambda^l \partial_s^k \partial_u^j \mathcal{F}(\lambda, 0, u)(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_l, u_1, \dots, u_j)\|_0 \leq c_{jkl} \|\lambda_1\| \dots \|\lambda_l\| \|u_1\|_l \dots \|u_j\|_l,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the norm in $\Lambda$.

## 2.2 Proof of Theorem 2.2

In this subsection we prove Theorem 2.2. Hence we suppose all assumptions of this theorem to be fulfilled.

First we show local existence and uniqueness for the equation (1.1) by means of the Banach fixed point theorem. The only difference between our proof and the proof of the classical implicit function theorem is that we consider the fixed point problem (2.10) below, while in the proof of the classical implicit function theorem it suffices to consider the slightly simpler fixed point problem $u - \partial_u F(0,u_0)^{-1}F(\lambda,u) = u$.

**Lemma 2.5** *There exist $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$ and $\delta > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]$ there exists a unique solution $u = \hat{u}(\lambda)$ to (1.1) with $\|u - u_0\|_0 \le \delta$.*

**Proof.** Take $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0]$. Because of the assumptions (2.8) and (2.9), the operator $\partial_u F(\lambda,u_0)$ is bijective from $U_0$ to $U_0$. Hence, the equation (1.1) is equivalent to the fixed point problem

$$G(\lambda,u) := u - \partial_u F(\lambda,u_0)^{-1}F(\lambda,u) = u. \tag{2.10}$$

Moreover, we have

$$G(\lambda,u_1) - G(\lambda,u_2) = \int_0^1 \left(I - \partial_u F(\lambda,u_0)^{-1}\partial_u F(\lambda,tu_1+(1-t)u_2)\right)(u_1-u_2)\,dt$$

and

$$\left(I - \partial_u F(\lambda,u_0)^{-1}\partial_u F(\lambda,u)\right)v = -\partial_u F(\lambda,u_0)^{-1}\int_0^1 \partial_u^2 F(\lambda,tu_0+(1-t)u)(u_0-u,v)\,dt.$$

Hence, assumptions (2.5) and (2.9) yield that for all positive $\delta < 1$

$$\|\left(I - \partial_u F(\lambda,u_0)^{-1}\partial_u F(\lambda,u)\right)v\|_0 \le \frac{\delta c_{200}}{c_0}\|v\|_0 \text{ for all } u \in B_\delta(u_0), v \in U_0,$$

where $B_\delta(u_0) := \{u \in U_0 : \|u-u_0\|_0 \le \delta\}$ is the closed ball of radius $\delta$ around $u_0$. Therefore, if $\delta$ is sufficiently small, then

$$\|I - \partial_u F(\lambda,u_0)^{-1}\partial_u F(\lambda,u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_0)} \le \frac{1}{2} \text{ for all } u \in B_\delta(u_0), \tag{2.11}$$

and hence

$$\|G(\lambda,u_1) - G(\lambda,u_2)\|_0 \le \frac{1}{2}\|u_1-u_2\|_0 \text{ for all } u_1,u_2 \in B_\delta(u_0). \tag{2.12}$$

Further, for $u \in B_\delta(u_0)$ we have

$$\|G(\lambda,u) - u_0\|_0 \le \|G(\lambda,u) - G(\lambda,u_0)\|_0 + \|\partial_u F(\lambda,u_0)^{-1}F(\lambda,u_0)\|_0 \le \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{1}{c_0}\|F(\lambda,u_0)\|_0.$$

But $F(\cdot,u_0)$ is continuous by (2.4). Hence, there exists $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]$ the map $G(\lambda,\cdot)$ is a strict contraction of $B_\delta(u_0)$. Then the Banach fixed point theorem yields that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]$ there exists exactly one solution $u = \hat{u}(\lambda) \in B_\delta(u_0)$ to (1.1). □

For proving Theorem 2.2 it remains to prove the solution regularity property

$$\hat{u}(\lambda) \in U_l \text{ for all } \lambda \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \text{ and } l = 1, 2, \ldots \tag{2.13}$$

and the smooth dependence property

$$\lambda \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \mapsto \hat{u}(\lambda) \in U_l \text{ is } C^\infty\text{-smooth for all } l = 0, 1, \ldots. \tag{2.14}$$

In order to prove (2.13) and (2.14), we introduce maps $u_n : [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \to B_\delta(u_0)$ for $n = 0, 1, \ldots$ by

$$u_0(\lambda) := u_0,\ u_{n+1}(\lambda) := G(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) = u_n(\lambda) - \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)). \tag{2.15}$$

Since the contraction constant of $G(\lambda, \cdot)$ is independent of $\lambda$ (cf. (2.12)), we have

$$\|u_n(\lambda) - \hat{u}(\lambda)\|_0 \to 0 \text{ for } n \to \infty \text{ uniformly in } \lambda. \tag{2.16}$$

Hence, because of a classical theorem from calculus (see, e.g. [9, Theorem 8.6.3]), for proving (2.13) and (2.14) it is sufficient to show that for all nonnegative integers $l$ and $n$

$$u_n(\lambda) \in U_l \text{ for all } \lambda \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \tag{2.17}$$

and

$$\lambda \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \mapsto u_n(\lambda) \in U_l \text{ is } C^\infty\text{-smooth} \tag{2.18}$$

and that for all nonnegative integers $k$ and $l$

$$u_n^{(k)}(\lambda) \text{ converges in } U_l \text{ for } n \to \infty \text{ uniformly in } \lambda. \tag{2.19}$$

**Lemma 2.6** *For all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, all positive integers $l$ and all $u \in U_l$ we have $F(\lambda, u) \in U_l$ and*

$$\begin{aligned}
&T(s)A^l F(\lambda, u) - \partial_u \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, T(s)u) T(s) A^l u \\
&= \sum_{k=2}^{l} \sum_{j_1 + \ldots + j_k = l} c^0_{j_1 \ldots j_k} \partial_u^k \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, T(s)u) \left(T(s)A^{j_1}u, \ldots, T(s)A^{j_k}u\right) \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} \sum_{k=1}^{l-j} \sum_{j_1 + \ldots + j_k = l-j} c^j_{j_1 \ldots j_k} \partial_s^j \partial_u^k \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, T(s)u) \left(T(s)A^{j_1}u, \ldots, T(s)A^{j_k}u\right) \\
&+ \partial_s^l \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, T(s)u),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

*where $c^j_{j_1 \ldots j_k}$ are certain natural numbers not depending on $\lambda$, $s$ and $u$.*

**Proof.** Because of (2.2) we have

$$T(s)F(\lambda, u) = \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, T(s)u). \tag{2.21}$$

If $u \in U_l$, then $T(\cdot)u \in C^l(\mathbb{R}; U_0)$, and hence $\mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, T(\cdot)u) \in C^l(\mathbb{R}; U_0)$ due to (2.3). Then, (2.21) yields $T(\cdot)F(\lambda, u) \in C^l(\mathbb{R}; U_0)$, i.e. $F(\lambda, u) \in U_l$.

Given $u \in U_1$, we can differentiate (2.21) with respect to $s$ and get $T(s)AF(\lambda, u) - \partial_u \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, T(s)u)T(s)Au = \partial_s \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, T(s)u)$. The formula (2.20) with $l = 1$ is therewith proved.

Now we do induction on $l$. Suppose (2.20) is true for a fixed $l$. Given $u \in U_{l+1}$, we can differentiate (2.20) with respect to $s$, and, using the chain rule, get (2.20) with $l$ replaced by $l + 1$. □

For brevity, for all positive integers $l$ we introduce maps $F_l : [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times U_{l-1} \to U_0$ given by the right-hand side of (2.20) with $s = 0$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} F_l(\lambda, u) \;:=\; & \sum_{k=2}^{l} \sum_{j_1+\ldots+j_k=l} c^0_{j_1\ldots j_k} \partial_u^k F(\lambda, u) \left(A^{j_1}u, \ldots, A^{j_k}u\right) \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} \sum_{k=1}^{l-j} \sum_{j_1+\ldots+j_k=l-j} c^j_{j_1\ldots j_k} \partial_s^j \partial_u^k \mathcal{F}(\lambda, 0, u) \left(A^{j_1}u, \ldots, A^{j_k}u\right) \\ & + \partial_s^l \mathcal{F}(\lambda, 0, u). \end{aligned}$$

Then (2.20) with $s = 0$ reads

$$A^l F(\lambda, u) - \partial_u F(\lambda, u) A^l u = F_l(\lambda, u) \text{ for all } u \in U_l. \tag{2.22}$$

Moreover, it follows directly from the assumptions (2.3)–(2.5) that

$$F_l(\lambda, \cdot) \in C^\infty(U_{l-1}; U_0), \tag{2.23}$$

$$\partial_u^j F_l(\cdot, u)(u_1, \ldots, u_j) \in C^m([-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]; U_0) \text{ for all } u, u_1, \ldots, u_j \in U_{l+m-1} \tag{2.24}$$

and that there exists $\tilde{d}_{jlm} > 0$ such that for all $u, u_1, \ldots, u_l \in U_{l+m-1}$ with $\|u - u_0\|_{l+m-1} \leq 1$ and for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ it holds

$$\|\partial_\lambda^m \partial_u^j F_l(\lambda, u)(u_1, \ldots, u_j)\|_0 \leq \tilde{d}_{jlm} \|u_1\|_{l+m-1} \ldots \|u_j\|_{l+m-1}. \tag{2.25}$$

**Remark 2.7** Due to (2.22), the map $u \in U_l \mapsto A^l F(\lambda, u) - \partial_u F(\lambda, u) A^l u$ can be extended to a smooth map from $U_{l-1}$ into $U_0$, although the maps $u \in U_l \mapsto A^l F(\lambda, u)$ and $u \in U_l \mapsto \partial_u F(\lambda, u) A^l u$ cannot be extended in such a way, in general. This will be essentially used in the proofs of Lemmas 2.15 and 2.16 below. Moreover, because of (2.23), one can differentiate the identity (2.22) in $u$ and get

$$\begin{aligned} & A^l \partial_u F(\lambda, u) v - \partial_u F(\lambda, u) A^l v \\ & = \partial_u F_l(\lambda, u) v + \partial_u^2 F(\lambda, u)(A^l u, v) =: K_l(\lambda, u) v \text{ for all } u, v \in U_l. \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Here for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $u \in U_l$ the linear operator $K_l(\lambda, u)$, which is defined by (2.26), is bounded from $U_{l-1}$ to $U_0$. In other words: The linear bounded operators $v \in U_l \mapsto A^l \partial_u F(\lambda, u) v \in U_0$ and $v \in U_l \mapsto \partial_u F(\lambda, u) A^l v \in U_0$ cannot be extended to linear bounded operators from $U_{l-1}$ to $U_0$, in general, but their difference can be extended in such a way. Even more: From (2.5) and (2.25) it follows that there exists $\tilde{c}_l > 0$ such that for all $u \in U_l$ with $\|u - u_0\|_l \leq 1$ and for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ it holds

$$\|K_l(\lambda, u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_{l-1}; U_0)} \leq \tilde{c}_l. \tag{2.27}$$

**Lemma 2.8** *(i) For all all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and all nonnegative integers $l$ it holds $F(\lambda, \cdot) \in C^\infty(U_l; U_l)$.*

*(ii) For all nonnegative integers $j, l, m$ and all $u, u_1, \dots, u_j \in U_{l+m}$ it holds $\partial_u^j F(\cdot, u)(u_1, \dots, u_j) \in C^m([-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]; U_l)$.*

*(iii) For all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and all nonnegative integers $j, l, m$ there exists $d_{jlm} > 0$ such that for all $u, u_1, \dots, u_j \in U_{l+m}$ with $\|u - u_0\|_{l+m} \le 1$ it holds*

$$\|\partial_\lambda^m \partial_u^j F(\lambda, u)(u_1, \dots, u_j)\|_l \le d_{jlm} \|u_1\|_{l+m} \dots \|u_j\|_{l+m}. \tag{2.28}$$

**Proof.** Claim (i) follows from (2.3), (2.22) and (2.23).

Differentiating the identity (2.22) $j$-times in $u$, we get for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $u, u_1, \dots, u_j \in U_l$

$$\begin{aligned} &A^l \partial_u^j F(\lambda, u)(u_1, \dots, u_j) - \sum_{k=1}^{j} \partial_u^j F(\lambda, u)(u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}, A^l u_k, u_{k+1}, \dots, u_j) \\ &\quad = \partial_u^j F_l(\lambda, u)(u_1, \dots, u_j) + \partial_u^{j+1} F(\lambda, u)(A^l u, u_1, \dots, u_j). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore Claim (ii) follows from (2.4).

Finally, for fixed $u, u_1, \dots, u_j \in U_{l+m}$ the last identity can be differentiated $m$-times in $\lambda$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned} &A^l \partial_\lambda^m \partial_u^j F(\lambda, u)(u_1, \dots, u_j) - \sum_{k=1}^{j} \partial_\lambda^m \partial_u^j F(\lambda, u)(u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}, A^l u_k, u_{k+1}, \dots, v_j) \\ &\quad = \partial_\lambda^m \partial_u^j F_l(\lambda, u)(u_1, \dots, u_j) + \partial_\lambda^m \partial_u^{j+1} F(\lambda, u)(A^l u, u_1, \dots, u_j). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (2.5) and (2.25) yield the Claim (iii). □

**Lemma 2.9** *For all nonnegative integers $l$ and all positive integers $m$ the map $(\lambda, u) \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times U_{l+m} \mapsto F(\lambda, u) \in U_l$ is $C^m$-smooth.*

**Proof.** We use the so-called converse to Taylor's theorem (see, e.g., [1, Supplement 2.4B]). This theorem claims that the lemma is true if there exist continuous maps

$$G_{jk} : [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times U_{l+m} \to \mathcal{S}_j(U_{l+m}; U_l) \text{ and } R_j : ([-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times U_{l+m})^2 \to \mathcal{S}_j(U_{l+m}; U_l)$$

with

$$R_j(\lambda, u, 0, 0) = 0 \tag{2.29}$$

and

$$F(\lambda + \mu, u + v) - F(\lambda, u) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-j} \mu^k G_{jk}(\lambda, u) v^j + \sum_{j=0}^{m} \mu^{m-j} R_j(\lambda, u, \mu, v) v^j. \tag{2.30}$$

As usual, here we denote by $G_{jk}(\lambda, u)v^j \in U_l$ the element which one gets by applying the multilinear operator $G_{jk}(\lambda, u)$ to the tuple $(v, \dots, v) \in U_{l+m}^j$. Similar notation rule is also used for $R_j(\lambda, u, \mu, v)v^j$ and will be used below.

Because of the assumption (2.3) we can apply the classical (direct) Taylor theorem (cf., e.g., [1, Theorem 2.4.15]) to the map $F(\lambda+\mu,\cdot): U_0 \to U_0$, and we get

$$F(\lambda+\mu,u+v) - \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{1}{j!}\partial_u^j F(\lambda+\mu,u)v^j$$
$$= \frac{1}{(m-1)!}\int_0^1 (1-t)^{m-1}\left(\partial_u^m F(\lambda+\mu,u+tv) - \partial_u^m F(\lambda+\mu,u)\right)v^m dt.$$

Similarly, on the account of the assumption (2.4), we can apply the Taylor theorem to the map $\partial_u^j F(\cdot,u)v^j : [-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0] \to U_0$ for $v \in U_m$ and $j = 0,1,\dots,m-1$, and we get

$$\partial_u^j F(\lambda+\mu,u)v^j - \sum_{k=0}^{m-j} \frac{\mu^k}{k!}\partial_\lambda^k \partial_u^j F(\lambda,u)v^j$$
$$= \frac{\mu^{m-j}}{(m-j-1)!}\int_0^1 (1-t)^{m-j-1}\left(\partial_\lambda^{m-j}\partial_u^j F(\lambda+t\mu,u) - \partial_\lambda^{m-j}\partial_u^j F(\lambda,u)\right)v^j dt.$$

This yields (2.30) with

$$G_{jk}(\lambda,u)(v_1,\dots,v_j) := \frac{1}{j!k!}\partial_\lambda^k \partial_u^j F(\lambda,u)(v_1,\dots,v_j), \tag{2.31}$$

$$R_j(\lambda,u,\mu,v)(v_1,\dots,v_j)$$
$$:= \frac{1}{(m-j-1)!j!}\int_0^1 (1-t)^{m-j-1}\left(\partial_\lambda^{m-j}\partial_u^j F(\lambda+t\mu,u) - \partial_\lambda^{m-j}\partial_u^j F(\lambda,u)\right)(v_1,\dots,v_j)dt$$
$$\text{for } j = 0,1,2,\dots,m-1 \tag{2.32}$$

and

$$R_m(\lambda,u,\mu,v)(v_1,\dots,v_m)$$
$$:= \frac{1}{(m-1)!}\int_0^1 (1-t)^{m-1}\left(\partial_u^m F(\lambda+\mu,u+tv) - \partial_u^m F(\lambda,u)\right)(v_1,\dots,v_m)dt \tag{2.33}$$

The property (2.29) follows directly from the definition (2.32). On the account of (2.28), the multilinear operators defined by (2.31)–(2.33) are bounded from $U_{l+m}^j$ to $U_l$ and from $U_{l+m}^m$ to $U_l$, respectively. Moreover, the map $(\lambda,u) \in [-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0]\times U_{l+m} \mapsto G_j(\lambda,u) \in \mathcal{S}_j(U_{l+m};U_l)$ is continuous. Indeed,

$$\left(G_{jk}(\lambda+\mu,u+v) - G_{jk}(\lambda,u)\right)(v_1,\dots,v_j)$$
$$= \frac{1}{j!k!}\int_0^1 \left(\partial_\lambda^k \partial_u^{j+1} F(\lambda+\mu,u+tv)(v,v_1,\dots,v_j) + \mu\partial_\lambda^{k+1}\partial_u^j F(\lambda+t\mu,u)(v_1,\dots,v_j)\right)dt.$$

Since $j+k \le m$ and $j \ge 1$ (cf. (2.30)), we have $k \le m-1$. Hence, we get from (2.28) the convergency

$$\|G_{jk}(\lambda+\mu,u+v) - G_{jk}(\lambda,u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_{l+m};U_l)} \to 0 \text{ for } |\mu| + \|v\|_{l+m} \to 0.$$

Here we used that $A$ is a closed linear operator in $U_0$, and hence $A\int_0^1 f(t)dt = \int_0^1 Af(t)dt$ for any continuous function $f : [0,1] \to U_1$.

Similarly one shows that for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ the maps $(\lambda, u, \mu, v) \in ([-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times U_{l+m})^2 \mapsto R_j(\lambda, u, \mu, v) \in \mathcal{S}_j(U_{l+m}; U_l)$ are continuous. In the remaining case $j = 0$ we have to show (cf. (2.32)) that the map

$$(\lambda, \mu, u) \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]^2 \times U_{l+m} \mapsto \int_0^1 (1-t)^{m-1} \left(\partial_\lambda^m F(\lambda + t\mu, u) - \partial_\lambda^m F(\lambda, u)\right) dt \in U_l$$

is continuous. But this follows from the following two facts: First, because of (2.28) we have

$$\|\partial_\lambda^m F(\lambda+t\mu, u+v) - \partial_\lambda^m F(\lambda+t\mu, u)\|_l = \left\| \int_0^1 \partial_\lambda^m \partial_u F(\lambda + t\mu, u + sv) v ds \right\|_l \le \text{const} \|v\|_{l+m},$$

where the constant does not depend on $\lambda, t, \mu$ and $u$. And, second, due to Lemma 2.8 (ii), the map $\partial_\lambda^m F(\cdot, u) : [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \to U_l$ is continuous for all $u \in U_{l+m}$. □

**Lemma 2.10** *For all nonnegative integers $l$ we have $u_0 \in U_l$.*

**Proof.** Thanks to the assumption (2.1), for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ the element $u = T(s)u_0$ is a solution to the equation $\mathcal{F}(0, s, u) = T(s)F(0, T(-s)u) = 0$. Further, because of the assumption (2.3) we have $\mathcal{F}(0, \cdot, \cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times U_0; U_0)$. Finally, (2.8) and (2.9) give that the operator $\partial_u \mathcal{F}(0, 0, u_0) = \partial_u F(0, u_0)$ is bijective from $U_0$ to $U_0$. Hence, the classical implicit function theorem implies that the map $s \approx 0 \mapsto T(s)u_0 \in U_0$ is $C^\infty$-smooth. This yields the claim. □

**Lemma 2.11** *For all nonnegative integers $l$ there exist $c_l > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and all $f \in U_l$ it holds $\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} f \in U_l$ and*

$$\|\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} f\|_l \le c_l \|f\|_l. \tag{2.34}$$

**Proof.** The operator $\partial_u \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, T(s)u_0) = T(s)\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)T(-s)$ is an isomorphism from $U_0$ to $U_0$, and the map $s \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \partial_u \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, T(s)u_0) \in \mathcal{L}(U_0)$ is $C^\infty$-smooth because of (2.3) and Lemma 2.10. Hence, for any $f \in U_l$ the map $s \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto T(s)\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} f = \partial_u \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, T(s)u_0)^{-1} T(s) f \in U_0$ is $C^l$-smooth, i.e. $\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} f \in U_l$.

Now, let us prove (2.34) by induction on $l$. For $l = 0$ this follows from the assumption (2.9).

Let us do the induction step. Suppose that (2.34) is true for an arbitrary fixed $l$. Take $f \in U_{l+1}$. From (2.26) it follows

$$A^{l+1} \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} f = \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} \left(A^{l+1} f - K_{l+1}(\lambda, u_0) \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} f\right). \tag{2.35}$$

Therefore (2.27) and the induction assumption imply

$$\begin{aligned} &\|A^{l+1} \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} f\|_0 \le c_0 \left(\|A^{l+1} f\|_0 + \|K_{l+1}(\lambda, u_0) \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} f\|_0\right) \\ &\le c_0 \left(\|f\|_{l+1} + \tilde{c}_{l+1} \|F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} f)\|_l\right) \le c_0 \left(\|f\|_{l+1} + \tilde{c}_{l+1} c_l \|f\|_l\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 2.12** *For all nonnegative integers $l$ and $n$ it holds (2.17).*

**Proof.** We do induction on $n$. For $n = 0$ the claim is true because of Lemma 2.10. In order to do the induction step, let us suppose that $u_n(\lambda)$ belongs to all spaces $U_l$. Then Lemma 2.6 yields $F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) \in U_l$, and Lemma 2.11 implies $u_{n+1}(\lambda) = u_n(\lambda) - \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) \in U_l$. □

**Lemma 2.13** *For all nonnegative integers $l$ and $m$*

$$\partial_u F(\cdot, u_0)^{-1} f \in C^m([-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]; U_l) \text{ for all } f \in U_{l+m} \tag{2.36}$$

*and there exist $c_{lm} > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $f \in U_{l+m}$ it holds*

$$\left\| \frac{d^m}{d\lambda^m} \left[ \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} f \right] \right\|_l \leq c_{lm} \|f\|_{l+m}. \tag{2.37}$$

**Proof.** We do induction on $m$. For brevity set $A(\lambda) := \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)$.

First consider the case $m = 0$. For $f \in U_l$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \left( A(\lambda+\mu)^{-1} - A(\lambda)^{-1} \right) f \right\|_l = \left\| A(\lambda+\mu)^{-1} \left( A(\lambda) - A(\lambda+\mu) \right) A(\lambda)^{-1} f \right\|_l \\ &\leq c_l \left\| \left( A(\lambda) - A(\lambda+\mu) \right) A(\lambda)^{-1} f \right\|_l \to 0 \text{ for } \mu \to 0 \end{aligned}$$

because of Lemma 2.8 (ii) with $j = 1, m = 0$. Moreover, (2.37) with $m = 0$ is proved in Lemma 2.11.

Now we consider the case $m = 1$. Take $f \in U_{l+1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( A(\lambda+\mu)^{-1} - A(\lambda)^{-1} + \mu A(\lambda)^{-1} A'(\lambda) A(\lambda)^{-1} \right) f \\ &= A(\lambda+\mu)^{-1} \left( A(\lambda) - A(\lambda+\mu) + \mu A'(\lambda) \right) A(\lambda)^{-1} f \\ &+ \mu \left( A(\lambda+\mu)^{-1} - A(\lambda)^{-1} \right) A'(\lambda) A^{-1}(\lambda) f. \end{aligned}$$

Here $A'(\lambda) := \partial_\lambda \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0) \in \mathcal{L}(U_{l+1}; U_l)$ is the derivative of $A(\lambda)$ with respect to $\lambda$. The $U_l$-norm of the first term in the right-hand side is $o(\mu)$ for $\mu \to 0$ because of Lemma 2.8 (ii) with $j = m = 1$. And the $U_l$-norm of the second term in the right-hand side is $o(\mu)$ for $\mu \to 0$ because of the first step ($m = 0$) of this proof. Hence, $A(\cdot)^{-1} f$ is differentiable as a map from $[-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ to $U_l$, and the derivative in $\lambda$ is $-A(\lambda)^{-1} A'(\lambda) A(\lambda)^{-1} f$. Moreover, (2.37) with $m = 1$ follows from (2.28) and (2.34). Similarly one shows the continuity of the derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \left( A(\lambda+\mu)^{-1} A'(\lambda+\mu) A(\lambda+\mu)^{-1} - A(\lambda)^{-1} A'(\lambda) A(\lambda)^{-1} \right) f \right\|_l \\ &\leq c_l d_{1l1} \left\| \left( A(\lambda+\mu)^{-1} - A(\lambda)^{-1} \right) f \right\|_l \\ &+ c_l \left\| \left( A'(\lambda+\mu) - A'(\lambda) \right) A(\lambda)^{-1} f \right\|_l \\ &+ \left\| \left( A(\lambda+\mu)^{-1} - A(\lambda)^{-1} \right) A'(\lambda) A(\lambda)^{-1} f \right\|_l . \end{aligned} \tag{2.38}$$

This tends to zero because of the case $m = 0$ and because of Lemma 2.8 (ii) with $j = m = 1$.

Now we do the induction step from $m$ to $m+1$. Suppose that for a fixed $m \geq 1$ and all $l$ the assertions of the lemma are true. For $k = 0, 1, \ldots, m$ and $l = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ we consider the map

$$B_k^l : ([-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times U_{k+l} \to U_l : \ B_k^l(\lambda, g) := \frac{d^k}{d\lambda^k} A(\lambda)^{-1} g. \tag{2.39}$$

Due to the induction assumption we have

$$\|B_k^l(\lambda, g)\|_l \leq c_{lk} \|g\|_{k+l}. \tag{2.40}$$

Take $f \in U_{l+m+1}$. We have to show that $A(\cdot)^{-1} f \in C^{m+1}([-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]; U_l)$ or, what is the same, that $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \mapsto A(\lambda)^{-1} A'(\lambda) A(\lambda)^{-1} f \in U_l$ is $C^m$-smooth. For that it is sufficient to show that

$$(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]^3 \mapsto A(\lambda)^{-1} A'(\mu) A(\nu)^{-1} f \in U_l \text{ is } C^m\text{-smooth.} \tag{2.41}$$

Because of Lemma 2.8 (ii) and the induction assumption, the partial derivative $\partial_\lambda^i \partial_\mu^j \partial_\nu^k$ of the map (2.41) with $i + j + k \leq m$ exists and is equal to

$$(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]^3 \mapsto B_i^l(\lambda, A^{(j+1)}(\mu) B_k^{l+m+1-k}(\nu, f)) \in U_l. \tag{2.42}$$

But (2.42) is a superposition of the following three continuous maps: First take

$$(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]^3 \mapsto (\lambda, \mu, \nu, B_k^{l+m+1-k}(\nu, f)) \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]^3 \times U_{l+m+1-k},$$

then take

$$(\lambda, \mu, \nu, g) \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]^3 \times U_{l+m+1-k} \mapsto (\lambda, \mu, \nu, A^{(j+1)}(\mu) g) \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]^3 \times U_{l+m-j-k},$$

and finally take

$$(\lambda, \mu, \nu, h) \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]^3 \times U_{l+m-j-k} \hookrightarrow U_{i+l} \mapsto B_i^l(\lambda, h) \in U_l.$$

This means that the map (2.42) is continuous, hence, (2.41) is true.

It remains to show (2.37) with $m$ replaced by $m+1$. In order to show this we calculate (using the product rule)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^{m+1}}{d\lambda^{m+1}} \left[A(\lambda)^{-1} f\right] &= -\frac{d^m}{d\lambda^m} \left[A(\lambda)^{-1} A'(\lambda) A(\lambda)^{-1} f\right] \\ &= -\sum_{i+j+k=m} B_i^l(\lambda, A^{(j+1)}(\lambda) B_k^{l+m+1-k}(\lambda, f)). \end{aligned}$$

But (2.28) and (2.40) imply (for $i + j + k = m$ and $f \in U_{l+m+1}$)

$$\|B_i^l(\lambda, A^{(j+1)}(\lambda) B_k^{l+m+1-k}(\lambda, f))\|_l \leq \text{const} \|f\|_{l+m+1},$$

where the constant does not depend on $\lambda$ and $f$. $\square$

**Lemma 2.14** *For all nonnegative integers $l$ and $n$ it holds (2.18).*

**Proof.** We do induction on $n$. Obviously, for $n = 0$ assertion (2.18) is true.

Let us do the induction step. Suppose that (2.18) is true for a fixed $n$. On the account of (2.15), the induction step will be done if we show that for all nonnegative integers $l$ the map $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \mapsto \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) \in U_l$ is $C^\infty$-smooth. For that it is sufficient to show that all partial derivatives of the map

$$(\lambda, \mu) \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]^2 \mapsto \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} F(\mu, u_n(\mu)) \in U_l \tag{2.43}$$

exist and are continuous.

Because of Lemma 2.9 and of the induction assumption, for all $l$ the map $\mu \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \mapsto F(\mu, u_n(\mu)) \in U_l$ is $C^\infty$-smooth. Denote by $C_m^l(\mu)$ the $m$-th derivative of this map. Then Lemma 2.13 yields that all partial derivatives $\partial_\lambda^j \partial_\mu^m$ of the map (2.43) exist and equal to $(\lambda, \mu) \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]^2 \mapsto B_j^l(\lambda, C_m^{j+l}(\mu)) \in U_l$. Here we used the notation (2.39). But this map is continuous because it is the superposition of the following two continuous maps:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda, \mu) \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]^2 &\mapsto (\lambda, \mu, C_m^{j+l}(\mu)) \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]^2 \times U_{j+l}, \\ (\lambda, \mu, u) \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]^2 \times U_{j+l} &\mapsto B_j^l(\lambda, u) \in U_l. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 2.15** *For all nonnegative integers $l$ it holds*

$$u_n(\lambda) \text{ converges in } U_l \text{ for } n \to \infty \text{ uniformly in } \lambda \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]. \tag{2.44}$$

**Proof.** We do induction on $l$. Because of (2.16) the assertion (2.44) is true for $l = 0$.

Now let us do the induction step. Suppose that (2.44) is true for a certain $l$. We have to show that

$$A^{l+1} u_n(\lambda) \text{ converges in } U_0 \text{ for } n \to \infty \text{ uniformly in } \lambda \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]. \tag{2.45}$$

Let us introduce operators $L_{l+1}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{L}(U_l; U_0)$ by

$$L_{l+1}(\lambda) f := \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} K_{l+1}(\lambda, u_0) \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} f.$$

Then (2.15), (2.22) and (2.35) imply

$$\begin{aligned} &A^{l+1} \left( (u_{n+1}(\lambda) - u_n(\lambda)) \right) \\ &= -\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} \left( \partial_u F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) A^{l+1} u_n(\lambda) + F_{l+1}(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) \right) + L_{l+1}(\lambda) F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)). \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} &A^{l+1} u_{n+1}(\lambda) - \left( I - \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} \partial_u F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) \right) A^{l+1} u_n(\lambda) \\ &= -\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} F_{l+1}(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) + L_{l+1}(\lambda) F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.46}$$

Moreover, (2.11) we yields

$$\|I - \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} \partial_u F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda))\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_0)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ for all } \lambda \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]. \tag{2.47}$$

Hence, Lemma A.1 implies that (2.45) is true if the right-hand side of (2.46) converges in $U_0$ for $n \to \infty$ uniformly in $\lambda$.

Let us show that the right-hand side of (2.46) indeed converges in $U_0$ for $n \to \infty$ uniformly in $\lambda$. From (2.28), the induction assumption and

$$F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) - F(\lambda, u_m(\lambda)) = \int_0^1 \partial_u F(\lambda, s u_n(\lambda) + (1-s) u_m(\lambda)) \, (u_n(\lambda) - u_m(\lambda)) \, ds,$$

it follows that $F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda))$ converges in $U_l$ for $n \to \infty$ uniformly in $\lambda$. On the other hand, (2.27) and (2.34) yield

$$\|L_{l+1}(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_l:U_0)} \leq \text{const for all } \lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0].$$

Hence, $L_{l+1}(\lambda) F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda))$ converges in $U_l$ for $n \to \infty$ uniformly in $\lambda$.

We proced similarly with the remaining term in the right-hand side of (2.46). Because of (2.25) and (2.34) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} \left(F_{l+1}(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) - F_{l+1}(\lambda, u_m(\lambda))\right) \|_0 \\
&= \left\| \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} \int_0^1 \partial_u F_{l+1}(\lambda, s u_n(\lambda) + (1-s) u_m(\lambda)) \, (u_n(\lambda) - u_m(\lambda)) \, ds \right\|_0 \\
&\leq \text{const} \|u_n(\lambda) - u_m(\lambda)\|_l,
\end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero for $m, n \to \infty$ uniformly in $\lambda$ by the induction assumption. □

**Lemma 2.16** *For all nonnegative integers $k$ and $l$ it holds (2.19).*

**Proof.** We have to show that for all nonnegative integers $l$ and $m$ the sequence $A^l u_n^{(m)}(\lambda)$ converges in $U_0$ for $n \to \infty$ uniformly in $\lambda$, and we do this by induction on $m$. For $m = 0$ the claim is true because of Lemma 2.15.

Let us do the induction step $m \to m+1$. The induction assumption is that for a fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{for all } k = 1, \ldots, m \text{ and nonnegative integers } l \text{ the sequence } A^l u_n^{(k)}(\lambda) \\
&\text{converges in } U_0 \text{ for } n \to \infty \text{ uniformly with respect to } \lambda.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.48}$$

We have to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{for all nonnegative integers } l \text{ the sequence } A^l u_n^{(m+1)}(\lambda) \\
&\text{converges in } U_0 \text{ for } n \to \infty \text{ uniformly in } \lambda.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.49}$$

In order to prove (2.49), we differentiate the identity $\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)(u_n(\lambda) - u_{n+1}(\lambda)) = F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda))$ $m+1$ times in $\lambda$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=0}^{m+1} \binom{m+1}{j} \partial_\lambda^j \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0) \left( u_n^{(m+1-j)}(\lambda) - u_{n+1}^{(m+1-j)}(\lambda) \right) \\
&= \frac{d^{m+1}}{d\lambda^{m+1}} F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda))) = \frac{d^m}{d\lambda^m} \left( \partial_\lambda F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) + \partial_u F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) u_n'(\lambda) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Writing the terms with derivatives of order $m+1$ in the left-hand side and all other terms in the right-hand side, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_u F(\lambda, u_0) u_{n+1}^{(m+1)}(\lambda) - \left( \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0) - \partial_u F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) \right) u_n^{(m+1)}(\lambda) \\
&= G(\lambda, u_n(\lambda), u_{n+1}(\lambda), u_n'(\lambda), u_{n+1}'(\lambda), \dots, u_n^{(m)}(\lambda), u_{n+1}^{(m)}(\lambda))
\end{aligned} \tag{2.50}$$

with a certain map $G : [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \times U_{l+m+1}^{2(m+1)} \to U_l$. For example, for $m = 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&G(\lambda, u, v, u_1, v_1) = \partial_\lambda^2 F(\lambda, u) + 2\partial_\lambda \partial_u F(\lambda, u) u_1 + \partial_u^2 F(\lambda, u)(u_1, u_1), \\
&+2\partial_\lambda \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)(u_1 - v_1) + \partial_\lambda^2 \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)(u - v)
\end{aligned}$$

and for $m = 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&G(\lambda, u, v, u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2) = \partial_\lambda^3 F(\lambda, u) + 3\partial_\lambda^2 \partial_u F(\lambda, u) u_1 + 3\partial_\lambda \partial_u^2 F(\lambda, u)(u_1, u_1) \\
&+\partial_u^3 F(\lambda, u)(u_1, u_1, u_1) + 3\partial_u^2 F(\lambda, u)(u_1, u_2) \\
&+3\partial_\lambda \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)(u_2 - v_2) + 3\partial_\lambda^2 \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)(u_1 - v_1) + \partial_\lambda^3 \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)(u - v).
\end{aligned}$$

Because of (2.28) the maps $G(\lambda, \cdot) : U_{l+m+1}^{2(m+1)} \to U_l$ are Lipschitz continuous on bounded sets, with Lipschitz constants not depending on $\lambda$. Hence (2.48) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{for all } l = 0, 1, 2, \dots \text{ the sequence } G(\lambda, u_n(\lambda), u_{n+1}(\lambda), \dots, u_n^{(m)}(\lambda), u_{n+1}^{(m)}(\lambda)) \\
&\text{converges in } U_l \text{ for } n \to \infty \text{ uniformly in } \lambda.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.51}$$

Let us prove (2.49) by induction on $l$. In order to consider the case $l = 0$, we rewrite (2.50) as

$$\begin{aligned}
&u_{n+1}^{(m+1)}(\lambda) - \left( I - \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} \partial_u F(\lambda, u_n(\lambda)) \right) u_n^{(m+1)}(\lambda) \\
&= \partial_u F(\lambda, u_0)^{-1} G(\lambda, u_n(\lambda), u_{n+1}(\lambda), \dots, u_n^{(m)}(\lambda), u_{n+1}^{(m)}(\lambda)).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.52}$$

Because of (2.34) and (2.51) with $l = 0$ the right-hand side of (2.52) converges in $U_0$ for $n \to \infty$ uniformly in $\lambda$. Hence, (2.47) and Lemma A.1 imply that (2.49) with $l = 0$ is true.

For the induction step from $l$ to $l+1$ in (2.49) the induction assumption is that for a fixed $l$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{for } j = 0, 1, \dots, l \text{ the sequence } A^j u_n^{(m+1)}(\lambda) \text{ converges} \\
&\text{in } U_0 \text{ for } n \to \infty \text{ uniformly in } \lambda,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

and the induction claim reads

$$A^{l+1}u_n^{(m+1)}(\lambda) \text{ converges in } U_0 \text{ for } n\to\infty \text{ uniformly in } \lambda. \tag{2.54}$$

The two induction assumptions (2.48) and (2.53) together yield

$$\begin{aligned} &A^j u_n^{(k)}(\lambda) \text{ converges in } U_0 \text{ for } n\to\infty \text{ uniformly in } \lambda \text{ for} \\ &j=0,1,\ldots,\ k=0,1,\ldots,m \text{ and for } j=0,1,\ldots,l,\ k=m+1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.55}$$

In order to show that (2.55) implies (2.54), we apply $A^{l+1}$ to (2.50), use (2.26) and get

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_u F(\lambda,u_0)A^{l+1}u_{n+1}^{(m+1)}(\lambda) + \left(\partial_u F(\lambda,u_n(\lambda)) - \partial_u F(\lambda,u_0)\right)A^{l+1}u_n^{(m+1)}(\lambda) \\ &= K_{l+1}(\lambda,u_n(\lambda))u_n^{(m+1)}(\lambda) + K_{l+1}(\lambda,u_0)\left(u_{n+1}^{(m+1)}(\lambda) - u_n^{(m+1)}(\lambda)\right) \\ &+A^{l+1}G(\lambda,u_n(\lambda),u_{n+1}(\lambda),\ldots,u_n^{(m)}(\lambda),u_{n+1}^{(m)}(\lambda)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.56}$$

Because of (2.25) and (2.28) the map

$$(u,v)\in U_{l+1}\times U_l \mapsto K_{l+1}(\lambda,u)v = \partial_u F_l(\lambda,u) + \partial_u^2 F(\lambda,u)(A^l u,v)\in U_l$$

(cf. (2.26)) is Lipschitz continuous on bounded sets, with a Lipschitz constnat not depending on $\lambda$. Therefore $K_{l+1}(\lambda,u_n(\lambda))u_n^{(m+1)}(\lambda)$ converges in $U_0$ for $n\to\infty$ uniformly in $\lambda$. Hence, (2.50) and (2.55) imply that the right-hand side of (2.56) converges in $U_0$ for $n\to\infty$ uniformly in $\lambda$. Therefore, as above, (2.47) and Lemma A.1 imply (2.54). □

# 3 Time-periodic solutions to first-order hyperbolic systems

## 3.1 Setting and main result

In this section we consider the boundary value problem (1.2)–(1.4) where $m$ and $n$ are integers with $1\le m\le n-1$, $\varepsilon_0>0$ is fixed, and the coefficient functions $a_j:[0,1]\times[-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0]\to\mathbb{R}$, $b_j:\mathbb{R}\times[0,1]\times[-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0]\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ and $r_{jk}:\mathbb{R}\times[-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0]\to\mathbb{R}$ are supposed to be $C^\infty$-smooth. Moreover, $b_j$ and $r_{jk}$ are $2\pi$-periodic in $t$, and we suppose that

$$a_j(x,\lambda)\neq 0 \text{ for all } x\in[0,1],\lambda\in[-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0] \text{ and } j=1,\ldots,n, \tag{3.1}$$

$$a_j(x,\lambda)\neq a_k(x,\lambda) \text{ for all } x\in[0,1],\lambda\in[-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0] \text{ and } 1\le j\neq k\le n. \tag{3.2}$$

Speaking about solutions to (1.2)–(1.4), we will mean classical solutions, i.e., $C^1$-smooth maps $u:\mathbb{R}\times[0,1]\to\mathbb{R}^n$ which satisfy (1.2)–(1.4) pointwise.

Let $u_0=(u_{01},\ldots,u_{0n})$ be a solution to (1.2)–(1.4) with $\lambda=0$. Set

$$b_j^0(t,x,\lambda) := \partial_{u_j} b_j(t,x,\lambda,u_0(t,x)), \tag{3.3}$$

$$R := \max_{1\le j\le m} \sum_{k=m+1}^{n} \sum_{l=1}^{m} \max_{t,s} |r_{jk}(t,0) r_{kl}(s,0)| \exp \int_0^1 \max_{t,s} \left( \frac{b_k^0(t,x,0)}{a_k(x,0)} - \frac{b_j^0(s,x,0)}{a_j(x,0)} \right) dx,$$

$$S := \max_{m+1\le j\le n} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=m+1}^{n} \max_{t,s} |r_{jk}(t,0) r_{kl}(s,0)| \exp \int_0^1 \max_{t,s} \left( \frac{b_j^0(t,x,0)}{a_j(x,0)} - \frac{b_k^0(s,x,0)}{a_k(x,0)} \right) dx.$$

Suppose

$$R < 1 \text{ or } S < 1. \tag{3.4}$$

In the particular case $m = 1, n = 2$ we have $R = S$, and in this case we set

$$R_0(t) := \left| r_{12}(t,0) r_{21} \left( t + \int_0^1 \frac{d\xi}{a_2(\xi,0)}, 0 \right) \right|$$
$$\times \exp \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1}{a_2(x,0)} b_2^0 \left( t + \int_0^x \frac{d\xi}{a_2(\xi,0)}, x, 0 \right) - \frac{1}{a_1(x,0)} b_1^0 \left( t + \int_0^x \frac{d\xi}{a_1(\xi,0)}, x, 0 \right) \right) dx,$$

$$S_0(t) := \left| r_{21}(t,0) r_{12} \left( t - \int_0^1 \frac{d\xi}{a_1(\xi,0)}, 0 \right) \right|$$
$$\times \exp \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1}{a_2(x,0)} b_2^0 \left( t - \int_x^1 \frac{d\xi}{a_2(\xi,0)}, x, 0 \right) - \frac{1}{a_1(x,0)} b_1^0 \left( t - \int_x^1 \frac{d\xi}{a_1(\xi,0)}, x, 0 \right) \right) dx$$

and replace the assumption (3.4) by the weaker assumption

$$R(t) \neq 1 \text{ for all } t \text{ or } S(t) \neq 1 \text{ for all } t. \tag{3.5}$$

Write

$$\|u\|_0 := \max_{1\le j\le n} \max_{t,x} |u_j(t,x)|. \tag{3.6}$$

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

**Theorem 3.1** *Suppose (3.1) and (3.2). Further, suppose (3.4) if $n \ge 3$ and (3.5) if $m = 1, n = 2$. Finally, suppose that the linearized problem*

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \partial_t u_j + a_j(x,0)\partial_x u_j + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \partial_{u_k} b_j(t,x,0,u_0(t,x)) u_k = 0, \quad j = 1,\dots,n, \\ u_j(t+2\pi,x) = u_j(t,x), \quad j = 1,\dots,n, \\ u_j(t,0) = \sum_{k=m+1}^{n} r_{jk}(t,0) u_k(t,0), \quad j = 1,\dots,m, \\ u_j(t,1) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} r_{jk}(t,0) u_k(t,1), \quad j = m+1,\dots,n \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{3.7}$$

*does not have a solution $u \neq 0$.*

*Then there exist $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta > 0$ and a $C^\infty$-map $\hat{u} : \mathbb{R} \times [0,1] \times [-\varepsilon,\varepsilon] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the following is true:*

*(i) For all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]$ the function $\hat{u}(\cdot,\cdot,\lambda)$ is a solution to (1.2)–(1.4).*

*(ii) If $u$ is a solution to (1.2)–(1.4) with $|\lambda| + \|u - u_0\|_0 < \delta$, then $u(t,x) = \hat{u}(t,x,\lambda)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in [0,1]$. In particular, $u_0 = \hat{u}(\cdot,\cdot,0)$ is $C^\infty$-smooth.*

**Remark 3.2** Consider (1.2)–(1.4) with $m = n = 1$, $a_1(x, \lambda) = 1 + \lambda^2$ and $b_1(t, x, \lambda, u) = b(t, x)$. Then (1.2)–(1.4) reads

$$\partial_t u + (1 + \lambda^2)\partial_x u + b(t, x) = 0,\ u(t + 2\pi, x) = u(t, x),\ u(t, 0) = 0.$$

The solution is explicitely given by the formula

$$u(t, x) = -\frac{1}{1 + \lambda^2} \int_0^x b\left(\frac{\xi - x}{1 + \lambda^2} + t, \xi\right) d\xi.$$

It follows that $u$ depends smoothly on $\lambda$ if and only if $b$ is smooth in $t$. In other words, solutions to (1.2)–(1.4) do not depend pointwise smoothly on $\lambda$ if the functions $b_j(\cdot, x, \lambda, u)$ are not smooth, in general.

**Remark 3.3** Consider (1.2)–(1.4) with $m = 1, n = 2$, $r_{12}(t, \lambda) = r_{21}(t, \lambda) = 1$, $a_1(x, \lambda) = -a_2(x, \lambda) = 1 + \lambda^2$ and $b_j(t, x, \lambda, u) = 0$, i.e.

$$\partial_t u_1 + (1 + \lambda^2)\partial_x u_1 = \partial_t u_2 - (1 + \lambda^2)\partial_x u_2 = 0,\ u_1(t, 0) - u_2(t, 0) = u_1(t, 1) - u_2(t, 1) = 0.$$

Integration along characteristic curves combined with the boundary conditions gives (cf. also (3.14)–(3.15))

$$u_1(t, x) = u_2(t - (1 + \lambda^2)x, 0), \tag{3.8}$$
$$u_2(t, x) = u_1(t + (1 + \lambda^2)(x - 1), 1). \tag{3.9}$$

Inserting (3.9) into (3.8) and putting $x = 1$, we get

$$u_1(t, 1) = u_1(t - 2(1 + \lambda^2), 1). \tag{3.10}$$

If $(1 + \lambda^2)/2\pi$ is irrational, then the functional equation (3.10) does not have nontrivial continuous solutions. If

$$\frac{1 + \lambda^2}{2\pi} = \frac{p}{q} \text{ with } p \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } q \in \mathbb{N},$$

then any $2\pi/q$-periodic function is a solution to (3.10), and hence there are infinitely many solutions. This means that in this case all assumptions of Theorem 3.1 (with $u_0 = 0$) are fulfilled with the exception of (3.5) (because of $R_0(t) = S_0(t) = 1$ for all $t$), but the conclusion of Theorem 3.1 is wrong.

## 3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

In this subsection we prove Theorem 3.1. Hence, we suppose all assumptions of this theorem to be fulfilled. In order to use Theorem 2.2, we are going to represent problem (1.2)–(1.4) in the setting of Section 2. Let us introduce the corresponding objects:

We denote by $U_0$ the space of all continuous maps $u : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $u(\cdot, x)$ is $2\pi$-periodic, with the norm (3.6). The $C_0$-group $T(s)$ on $U_0$ is defined by

$$(T(s)u)(t, x) := u(t + s, x).$$

Hence, the corresponding infinitesimal generator is $A := \partial_t$, and the domain of definition of $A^l$ is

$$U_l := \{u \in U_0 : \ \partial_t^j u \in U_0 \text{ for all } j = 0, 1, \dots, l\}.$$

The spaces $U_l$ are Banach spaces with the norms

$$\|u\|_l := \sum_{j=0}^{l} \|\partial_t^j u\|_0.$$

Let us introduce characteristics of the system (1.2)

$$\tau_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda) := t + \int_x^\xi \frac{d\eta}{a_j(\eta, \lambda)}. \tag{3.11}$$

For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $x, \xi \in [0, 1]$, $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $u, v \in U_0$ we define

$$c_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda, v) := \exp \int_x^\xi \frac{\partial_{u_j} b_j(\tau_j(t, x, \eta, \lambda), \eta, \lambda, v(\tau_j(t, x, \eta, \lambda), \eta))}{a_j(\eta, \lambda)} \, d\eta. \tag{3.12}$$

Further, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in [0, 1]$, $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we define

$$f_j(t, x, \lambda, u, v) := \partial_{u_j} b_j(t, x, \lambda, v) u_j - b_j(t, x, \lambda, u). \tag{3.13}$$

The following calculations, the so-called integration along the characteristics of the hyperbolic system (1.2), are well-known: Let $u$ be a solution to (1.2)–(1.4) and $v \in U_0$ be arbitrary fixed. Then

$$\partial_t u_j(t, x) + a_j(x, \lambda) \partial_x u_j(t, x) + \partial_{u_j} b_j(t, x, \lambda, v(t, x)) u_j(t, x) = f_j(t, x, \lambda, u(t, x), v(t, x)),$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{d\xi} u_j(\tau_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \xi) + \frac{\partial_{u_j} b_j(\tau_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \xi, \lambda, v(\tau_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \xi))}{a_j(\xi, \lambda)} u_j(\tau_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \xi) \\ &= \frac{f_j(\tau_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \xi, \lambda, u(\tau_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \xi), v(\tau_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \xi))}{a_j(\xi, \lambda)}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating this in $\xi$ from zero to $x$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$ and from $x$ to one for $j = m+1, \dots, n$, and, using the boundary conditions (1.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned} u_j(t, x) &= c_j(t, x, 0, \lambda, v) \sum_{k=m+1}^{n} r_{jk}(\tau_j(t, x, 0, \lambda), \lambda) u_k(\tau_j(t, x, 0, \lambda), 0) \\ &\quad + \int_0^x \frac{c_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda, v)}{a_j(\xi, \lambda)} f_j(\tau_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \xi, \lambda, u(\tau_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \xi), v(\tau_j(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \xi)) d\xi, \\ &\quad j = 1, \dots, m, \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

$$u_j(t,x) = c_j(t,x,1,\lambda,v)\sum_{k=1}^{m} r_{jk}(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),1)$$
$$-\int_x^1 \frac{c_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda,v)}{a_j(\xi,\lambda)} f_j(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\lambda,u(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi),v(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi))d\xi,$$
$$j = m+1,\dots,n. \tag{3.15}$$

And vice versa: If $v \in U_1$ is given, then any solution $u \in U_1$ to (3.14)-(3.15) is a solution to (1.2)–(1.4) (in particular, $u$ is differentiable not only with respect to $t$, but also with respect to $x$). Remark that the right-hand sides of (3.14)-(3.15) depend on the artificially introduced function $v$, but the solutions $u$ to (3.14)-(3.15) do not.

If we set $b(t,x,\lambda,u) := (b_1(t,x,\lambda,u),\dots,b_n(t,x,\lambda,u))$ and

$$f(t,x,\lambda,u,v) := (f_1(t,x,\lambda,u,v),\dots,f_n(t,x,\lambda,u,v)), \tag{3.16}$$

then the nonlinear map $f(t,x,\lambda,\cdot,v)$ is the difference of the diagonal part of the linear map $\partial_u b(t,x,\lambda,u,v)|_{u=v}$ and of the nonlinear map $b(t,x,\lambda,\cdot)$. Hence, the diagonal part of $\partial_u f(t,x,\lambda,u,v)|_{u=v}$ vanishes, i.e. $\partial_{u_j} f_j(t,x,\lambda,u,v)|_{u=v} = 0$, cf. (3.13). This will be used later on in the proof of the key Lemma 3.10.

For $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0]$ and $v \in U_0$ we define linear bounded operators $C(\lambda,v) : U_0 \to U_0$ by

$$\left(C(\lambda,v)u\right)_j(t,x) := \begin{cases} c_j(t,x,0,\lambda,v)\displaystyle\sum_{k=m+1}^{n} r_{jk}(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda),\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda),0) \\ \qquad\qquad \text{for } j = 1,\dots,m, \\ c_j(t,x,1,\lambda,v)\displaystyle\sum_{k=1}^{m} r_{jk}(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),1) \\ \qquad\qquad \text{for } j = m+1,\dots,n. \end{cases} \tag{3.17}$$

Further, for $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0]$ we define nonlinear operators $D(\lambda,\cdot,\cdot) : U_0 \times U_0 \to U_0$ by

$$D(\lambda,u,v)_j(t,x) :=$$
$$\int_{x_j}^{x} \frac{c_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda,v)}{a_j(\xi,\lambda)} f_j(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\lambda,u(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi),v(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi))d\xi \tag{3.18}$$

Here and in what follows we write

$$x_j := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for} \quad j = 1,\dots,m, \\ 1 & \text{for} \quad j = m+1,\dots,n. \end{cases} \tag{3.19}$$

In this notation the system (3.14)–(3.15) can be written as the operator equation

$$u = C(\lambda,v)u + D(\lambda,u,v). \tag{3.20}$$

Remark again that the right-hand side of (3.20) depends on the artificially introduced function $v$, but the solutions $u$ to (3.20) do not. In particular, we have

$$\partial_v C(0,v)(u_0,w) + \partial_v D(\lambda,u_0,v)w = 0 \text{ for all } v,w \in U_0. \tag{3.21}$$

**Lemma 3.4** *The maps* $(s,u,v) \in \mathbb{R}\times U_0^2 \mapsto T(s)C(\lambda,T(-s)v)T(-s)u \in U_0$ *and* $(s,u,v) \in \mathbb{R}\times U_0^2 \mapsto T(s)D(\lambda,T(-s)u,T(-s)v) \in U_0$ *are* $C^\infty$*-smooth for all* $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0]$.

**Proof.** From (3.11) we have $\tau_j(t+s,x,\xi,\lambda) = \tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda)+s$. Then (3.12), (3.17) and (3.18) yield

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(T(s)C(\lambda,T(-s)v)T(-s)u\right)_j(t,x) = \\ &c_j^s(t,x,0,\lambda,v)\sum_{k=m+1}^{n} r_{jk}(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda)+s,\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda),0) \text{ for } j=1,\dots,m,\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(T(s)C(\lambda,T(-s)v)T(-s)u\right)_j(t,x) = \\ &c_j^s(t,x,1,\lambda,v)\sum_{k=1}^{m} r_{jk}(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda)+s,\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),1) \text{ for } j=m+1,\dots,n\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&T(s)D(\lambda,T(-s)u,T(-s)v)_j(t,x) = \\ &\int_{x_j}^{x}\frac{c_j^s(t,x,\xi,\lambda,v)}{a_j(\xi,\lambda)}f_j(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda)+s,\xi,\lambda,u(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi),v(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi))d\xi\end{aligned}$$

with

$$c_j^s(t,x,\xi,\lambda,v) := \exp\int_x^\xi \frac{\partial_{u_j}b_j(\tau_j(t,x,\eta,\lambda)+s,\eta,\lambda,v(\tau_j(t,x,\eta,\lambda),\eta))}{a_j(\eta,\lambda)}\,d\eta.$$

Since the functions $b_j$ are smooth, well-known differentiability properties of Nemytskii operators (see, e.g., [1, Lemma 2.4.18], [2, Lemma 6.1]) yield the claim of the lemma. □

**Remark 3.5** Suppose the coefficients $a_j$ to be independent on $\lambda$. Then also the characteristics $\tau_j$ are independent on $\lambda$, and hence the maps $\lambda \mapsto C(\lambda,v) \in \mathcal{L}(U_0)$ and $\lambda \mapsto D(\lambda,u,v) \in U_0$ are smooth for all $u,v \in U_0$. Therefore, in this case for $\lambda \approx 0$ the equation (3.20) can be solved with respect to $u \approx u_0$ by means of the classical implicit function theorem under natural assumptions.

But, if the coefficients $a_j$ depend on $\lambda$, then, unfortunately, the maps $\lambda \mapsto C(\lambda,v)u \in U_0$ and $\lambda \mapsto D(\lambda,u,v) \in U_0$ are not smooth (if $u$ and $v$ are only continuous and not smooth), in general. This makes the question, if the data-to-solution map corresponding to (3.20) is smooth, very delicate in the case if the coefficients $a_j$ depend on $\lambda$.

**Remark 3.6** If the coefficients $a_j$ would depend on $t$, then the characteristics $\tau_j$ are defined as the solutions to the initial value problem

$$\partial_\xi\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda) = \frac{1}{a_j(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\lambda)},\ \tau_j(t,x,x,\lambda) = t.$$

But then $\tau_j(t+s,x,\xi,\lambda) \neq \tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda)+s$, in general, and the proof of Lemma 3.4 could not be generalized to this case, in general. To get a result similar to Theorem 3.1, but with $t$-dependent coefficients $a_j$, it turns out that additional conditions of the type (3.4) should be assumed. The number of those conditions is $k+1$ in order the data-to-solution map to be $C^k$-smooth (see [17]).

In what follows we will use the operators $\mathcal{C}(\lambda), \mathcal{D}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{L}(U_0)$ defined for $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ by

$$\mathcal{C}(\lambda) := C(\lambda, u_0),\ \mathcal{D}(\lambda) := \partial_u D(\lambda, u, u_0)|_{u=u_0}. \tag{3.22}$$

From (3.17) and (3.18) it follows that

$$\left(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)u\right)_j(t,x) = \begin{cases} \sum\limits_{k=m+1}^{n} c_{jk}(t,x,\lambda) u_k(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda),0) \text{ for } j=1,\dots,m, \\ \sum\limits_{k=1}^{m} c_{jk}(t,x,\lambda) u_k(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),1) \text{ for } j=m+1,\dots,n \end{cases} \tag{3.23}$$

with

$$c_{jk}(t,x,\lambda) := c_j(t,x,x_j,\lambda,u_0) r_{jk}(\tau_j(t,x,x_j,\lambda),\lambda) \tag{3.24}$$

and

$$\left[\mathcal{D}(\lambda)u\right]_j(t,x) = \sum_{k\neq j} \int_{x_j}^{x} d_{jk}(t,x,\xi,\lambda) u_k(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi) d\xi \tag{3.25}$$

with

$$d_{jk}(t,x,\xi,\lambda) := -\frac{c_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda,u_0)}{a_j(\xi,\lambda)} \partial_{u_k} b_j(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\lambda,u_0(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi)). \tag{3.26}$$

**Lemma 3.7** *Suppose (3.4) if $n \geq 3$ and (3.5) if $m=1, n=2$. Then there exist $\varepsilon_1 \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$ and $d>0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_1]$ the operator $I-\mathcal{C}(\lambda)$ is bijective from $U_0$ to $U_0$ and $\|(I-\mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_0)} \leq d$.*

**Proof.** We will follow the ideas of [19, Lemma 3.1] and [21, Lemma 2.2 (i)].

Denote by $U_0(m)$ the space of all continuous maps $v : \mathbb{R}\times[0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^m$ with $v(t+2\pi,x) = v(t,x)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in [0,1]$, with the norm

$$\|v\| := \max_{1\leq j\leq m} \max_{t,x} |v_j(t,x)|.$$

Similarly we define the space $U_0(n-m)$. The spaces $U_0$ and $U_0(m)\times U_0(n-m)$ will be identified, i.e. elements $u \in U_0$ will be written as $u=(v,w)$ with $v \in U_0(m)$ and $w \in U_0(n-m)$. Then the operators $\mathcal{C}(\lambda)$ work as

$$\mathcal{C}(\lambda)u = (K(\lambda)w, L(\lambda)v) \text{ for } u=(v,w), \tag{3.27}$$

where the linear bounded operators $K(\lambda) : U_0(n-m) \to U_0(m)$ and $L(\lambda) : U_0(m) \to U_0(n-m)$ are defined by the right hand side of (3.17).

Let $f = (g, h) \in U_0$ with $g \in U_0(m)$ and $h \in U_0(n-m)$ be arbitrarily given. We have $u = \mathcal{C}(\lambda)u + f$ if and only if $v = K(\lambda)w + g,\ w = L(\lambda)v + h$, i.e., if and only if

$$v = K(\lambda)(L(\lambda)v + h) + g,\ w = L(\lambda)v + h. \tag{3.28}$$

This holds if and only if

$$v = K(\lambda)w + g,\ w = L(\lambda)(K(\lambda)w + g) + h.$$

If there exist $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $d > 0$ such for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1]$ the operator $I - K(\lambda)L(\lambda)$ is invertible on $U_0(m)$ and

$$\|(I - K(\lambda)L(\lambda))^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_0(m))} \leq d \text{ for all } \lambda \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1], \tag{3.29}$$

then (3.28) is uniquely solvable with respect to $(v, w)$ and $\|(v, w)\|_0 \leq$ const $\|(f, g)\|_0$, where the constant does not depend on $\lambda, f$ and $g$. The conclusion of the lemma is true. Similarly, if there exist $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $d > 0$ such for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1]$ the operator $I - L(\lambda)K(\lambda)$ is invertible on $U_0(n-m)$ and

$$\|(I - L(\lambda)K(\lambda))^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_0(n-m))} \leq d \text{ for all } \lambda \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1], \tag{3.30}$$

then the conclusion of the lemma is true also.

Let us prove (3.29) and (3.30) for $n \geq 3$. Because of (3.23) the equation $v = K(\lambda)L(\lambda)v + \tilde{g}$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=m+1}^{n} c_{jk}(t, x, \lambda) \sum_{l=1}^{m} c_{kl}(\tau_j(t, x, 0, \lambda), 0, \lambda) v_l(\tau_k(\tau_j(t, x, 0, \lambda), 0, 1, \lambda), 1) \\ &= v_j(t, x) - \tilde{g}_j(t, x),\ j = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

At $x = 1$ it reads

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=m+1}^{n} c_{jk}(t, 1, \lambda) \sum_{l=1}^{m} c_{kl}(\tau_j(t, 1, 0, \lambda), 0, \lambda) v_l(\tau_k(\tau_j(t, 1, 0, \lambda), 0, 1, \lambda), 1) \\ &= v_j(t, 1) - \tilde{g}_j(t, 1),\ j = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

Because of (3.3), (3.12), (3.19) and (3.24) the coefficients in (3.32) are

$$\begin{aligned} &c_{jk}(t, 1, \lambda) c_{kl}(\tau_j(t, 1, 0, \lambda), 0, \lambda) \\ &= r_{jk}(\tau_j(t, 1, 0, \lambda), \lambda) r_{kl}(\tau_k(\tau_j(t, 1, 0, \lambda), 0, 1, \lambda), \lambda) \times \\ &\times \exp \int_0^1 \left( \frac{b_k^0(\tau_k(\tau_j(t, 1, 0, \lambda), 0, \eta, \lambda), \eta, \lambda)}{a_k(\eta, \lambda)} - \frac{b_j^0(\tau_j(t, 1, \eta, \lambda), \eta, \lambda)}{a_j(\eta, \lambda)} \right) d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $\|v\| \leq 1$ the absolute value of the right-hand side of (3.32) can be estimated from above, for example, by

$$R(\lambda) := \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \sum_{k=m+1}^{n} \sum_{l=1}^{m} \max_{t,s} |r_{jk}(t, \lambda) r_{kl}(s, \lambda)| \exp \int_0^1 \max_{t,s} \left( \frac{b_k^0(t, x, \lambda)}{a_k(x, \lambda)} - \frac{b_j^0(s, x, \lambda)}{a_j(x, \lambda)} \right) dx.$$

Similarly, the equation $w = L(\lambda)K(\lambda)w + \tilde{h}$ is equivalent to

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m} c_{jk}(t,x,\lambda) \sum_{l=m+1}^{n} c_{kl}(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),1,\lambda) w_l(\tau_k(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),1,0,\lambda),0)$$
$$= w_j(t,x) - \tilde{h}_j(t,x),\ j = m+1,\dots,n.$$

At $x = 0$ it reads

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m} c_{jk}(t,0,\lambda) \sum_{l=m+1}^{n} c_{kl}(\tau_j(t,0,1,\lambda),1,\lambda) w_l(\tau_k(\tau_j(t,0,1,\lambda),1,0,\lambda),0)$$
$$= w_j(t,0) - \tilde{h}_j(t,0),\ j = m+1,\dots,n. \tag{3.33}$$

The coefficients in (3.33) are

$$c_{jk}(t,0,\lambda) c_{kl}(\tau_j(t,0,1,\lambda),1,\lambda)$$
$$= r_{jk}(\tau_j(t,0,1,\lambda),\lambda) r_{kl}(\tau_k(\tau_j(t,0,1,\lambda),1,0,\lambda),\lambda) \times$$
$$\times \exp \int_0^1 \left( \frac{b_j^0(\tau_j(t,0,\eta,\lambda),\eta,\lambda)}{a_j(\eta,\lambda)} - \frac{b_k^0(\tau_k(\tau_j(t,0,1,\lambda),1,\eta,\lambda),\eta,\lambda)}{a_k(\eta,\lambda)} \right) d\eta.$$

Hence, for $\|w\| \le 1$ the absolute value of the right-hand side of (3.33) can be estimated from above, for example, by

$$S(\lambda) := \max_{m+1 \le j \le n} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=m+1}^{n} \max_{t,s} |r_{jk}(t,\lambda) r_{kl}(s,\lambda)| \exp \int_0^1 \max_{t,s} \left( \frac{b_j^0(t,x,\lambda)}{a_j(x,\lambda)} - \frac{b_k^0(s,x,\lambda)}{a_k(x,\lambda)} \right) dx.$$

Since $R(\lambda)$ and $S(\lambda)$ depend continuously on $\lambda$ and $R(0) < 1$ or $S(0) < 1$ (see (3.4)), there exist $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and positive $d < 1$ such for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1]$ we have $R(\lambda) \le d$ or $S(\lambda) \le d$.

Suppose $R(\lambda) \le d$. Then the system (3.32) has a unique solution $(v_1(t,1),\dots,v_m(t,1))$, which is continuous and $2\pi$-periodic in $t$, and it holds

$$\max_{1 \le j \le m} \max_{t} |v_j(t,1)| \le \text{ const } \|\tilde{g}\|_0,$$

where the constant does not depend on $\lambda$ and $\tilde{g}$. Inserting this into (3.31), we see that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1]$ the system (3.31) has a unique solution $v$, and it holds $\|v\|_0 \le \text{const } \|\tilde{g}\|_0$, where the constant does not depend on $\lambda$ and $\tilde{g}$. Hence, (3.29) is true. Similary one shows that from $S(\lambda) \le d$ it follows (3.30).

Now, let us consider the case $m = 1, n = 2$. In this case the equation (3.32) reads

$$c_{12}(t,1,\lambda) c_{21} \left( t - \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{a_1(x,\lambda)}, 0, \lambda \right) v_1 \left( t + \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1}{a_2(x,\lambda)} - \frac{1}{a_1(x,\lambda)} \right) dx, 1 \right)$$
$$= v_1(t,1) - \tilde{g}_1(t,1).$$

If

$$\left| c_{12}(t,1,0) c_{21} \left( t - \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{a_1(x,0)}, 0, 0 \right) \right| \ne 1 \text{ for all } t, \tag{3.34}$$

then there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1]$ the first equation has a unique solution $v_1(t,1)$, which is continuous and $2\pi$-periodic with respect to $t$, and it holds

$$\max_t |v_j(t,1)| \le \text{const} \max_t |\tilde{g}_1(t,1)|,$$

where the constant does not depend on $\lambda$ and $\tilde{g}_1$. Then, as above, the conclusion of the lemma is true. On the other hand, equation (3.33) is

$$\begin{aligned} &c_{21}(t,0,\lambda)c_{12}\left(t+\int_0^1 \frac{dx}{a_2(x,\lambda)},1,\lambda\right) w_2\left(t+\int_0^1\left(\frac{1}{a_2(x,\lambda)}-\frac{1}{a_1(x,\lambda)}\right)dx,0\right)\\ &= w_1(t,0)-h_2(t,0), \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly to the above, one shows that the conclusion of the lemma is true if

$$\left|c_{21}(t,0,0)c_{12}\left(t+\int_0^1 \frac{dx}{a_2(x,0)},1,0\right)\right| \neq 1 \text{ for all } t. \tag{3.35}$$

But (3.11), (3.12) and (3.24) yield that the left-hand side of (3.34) is $R_0\left(t-\int_0^1 \frac{dx}{a_1(x,0)}\right)$ and the left-hand side of (3.35) is $S_0\left(t+\int_0^1 \frac{dx}{a_2(x,0)}\right)$. Hence, assumption (3.5) implies one of the conditions (3.34) and (3.35). □

**Remark 3.8** Let us revisit the example of Remark 3.3, i.e., consider (1.2)–(1.4) with $m=1, n=2$, $r_{12}(t,\lambda)=r_{21}(t,\lambda)=1$, $a_1(x,\lambda)=-a_2(x,\lambda)=1+\lambda^2$, $b_j(x,t,\lambda)=0$ and $u_0=0$. Then

$$\left(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)u\right)_j(t,x) = \begin{cases} u_2(0,t-(1+\lambda^2)x) \text{ for } j=1,\\ u_1(1,t+(1+\lambda^2)(x-1)) \text{ for } j=2. \end{cases}$$

Hence $I-\mathcal{C}(\lambda)$ is bijective on $U_0$ if and only if $(1+\lambda^2)/2\pi$ is irrational. This shows again that the map $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathcal{C}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{L}(U_0)$ is not continuous.

In what follows we will work with the Banach space $V$ and the Hilbert space $H$ defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &V := \{u \in U_0 :\ \partial_t u, \partial_x u \in U_0\},\ \|u\|_V := \|u\|_0 + \|\partial_t u\|_0 + \|\partial_x u\|_0,\\ &H := L^2\left((0,1)\times(0,2\pi);\mathbb{R}^n\right),\ \langle u,v\rangle := \int_0^{2\pi}\int_0^1 u(t,x)v(x,t)dxdt. \end{aligned}$$

The space $V$ is densely and compactly embedded into $U_0$, while $U_0$ is continuously embedded into $H$.

**Lemma 3.9** *It holds*

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0}\sup_{\|u\|_0\le 1}\langle\left(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)+\mathcal{D}(\lambda)-\mathcal{C}(0)-\mathcal{D}(0)\right)u,h\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } h \in H.$$

**Proof.** Take $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$, $u \in U$ and $h \in H$. Accordingly to (3.23), the scalar product $\langle (\mathcal{C}(\lambda) - \mathcal{C}(0))\, u, h\rangle$ equals

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} (c_{jk}(t,x,\lambda) u_k(\tau_j(t,x,x_j,\lambda),x_j) - c_{jk}(t,x,0) u_k(\tau_j(t,x,x_j,0),x_j))\, h_j(x,t) dt dx.$$

Denote by $t_j(\cdot, x, \xi, \lambda)$ the inverse function of $\tau_j(\cdot, x, \xi, \lambda)$ (cf. (3.11)), i.e.,

$$t_j(\tau, x, \xi, \lambda) := \tau - \int_x^{\xi} \frac{d\eta}{a_j(\eta, \lambda)}.$$

Then the change of integration variables $t \mapsto s$, which is defined by

$$t = \tau_j(s, x, \lambda) := t_j(\tau_j(s, x, x_j, 0), x, x_j, \lambda) = s + \int_x^{x_j} \left( \frac{1}{a_j(\eta,\lambda)} - \frac{1}{a_j(\eta, 0)} \right) d\eta,$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{2\pi} (c_{jk}(t,x,\lambda) u_k(\tau_j(t,x,x_j,\lambda),x_j) - c_{jk}(t,x,0) u_k(\tau_j(t,x,x_j,0),x_j))\, h_j(t,x) dt \\
&= \int_0^{2\pi} (c_{jk}(\tau_j(s,x,\lambda),x,\lambda) h_j(\tau_j(s,x,\lambda),x) - c_{jk}(s,x,0) h_j(s,x)))\, u_k(\tau_j(s,x,x_j,0),x_j) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\|u\|_0 \le 1} |\langle (\mathcal{C}(\lambda) - \mathcal{C}(0))\, u, h\rangle| \\
&\le \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \int_0^1 \int_0^{2\pi} |(c_{jk}(\tau_j(s,x,\lambda),x,\lambda) h_j(\tau_j(x,s,\lambda),x) - c_{jk}(s,x,0) h_j(s,x)))|\, ds dx \to 0
\end{aligned}$$

for $\lambda \to 0$. Here we used $\tau_j(s, x, 0) = s$ and the continuity in the mean of $L^2$-functions.

Similarly, accordingly to (3.25), we have

$$\langle \mathcal{D}(\lambda) u, h\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{k \ne j}^{n} \int_0^1 \int_{x_j}^{x} \int_0^{2\pi} d_{jk}(t,x,\xi,\lambda) u_k(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi) h_j(x,t) dt d\xi dx.$$

Hence, using the change of the integration variable $t = t_j(\tau_j(s, x, \xi, 0), x, \xi, \lambda)$, we get

$$\lim_{\lambda \to 0} \sup_{\|u\|_0 \le 1} \langle (\mathcal{D}(\lambda) - \mathcal{D}(0))\, u, h\rangle = 0.$$

□

**Lemma 3.10** *There exists $d > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $v \in V$ it holds $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 v \in V$, $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda) v \in V$ and*

$$\|\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 v\|_V + \|\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda) v\|_V \le d \|v\|_0.$$

**Proof.** We have to show that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $v \in V$ it holds $\partial_t(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v) \in U_0$, $\partial_x(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v) \in U_0$, $\partial_t(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 v) \in U_0$, $\partial_x(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 v) \in U_0$ and

$$\|\partial_t(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v)\|_0 + \|\partial_x(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v)\|_0 + \|\partial_t(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 v)\|_0 + \|\partial_x(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 v)\|_0 \le \text{const}\|v\|_0.$$

From (3.23) and (3.25) it follows that for all $v \in V$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v) &= C_0^t(\lambda)v + \mathcal{C}(\lambda)\partial_t v,\\
\partial_x(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v) &= C_0^x(\lambda)v + C_1^x(\lambda)\partial_t v,\\
\partial_t(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)v) &= D_0^t(\lambda)v + \mathcal{D}(\lambda)\partial_t v,\\
\partial_x(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)v) &= D_0^x(\lambda)v + D_1^x(\lambda)\partial_t v
\end{aligned}$$

with the operators $C_0^t(\lambda), C_1^t(\lambda), C_0^x(\lambda), C_1^x(\lambda), D_0^t(\lambda), D_1^t(\lambda), D_0^x(\lambda), D_1^x(\lambda) \in \mathcal{L}(U_0)$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[C_0^t(\lambda)v\right]_j(t,x) &:= \sum_{k=1}^n \partial_t c_{jk}(t,x,\lambda) v_k(\tau_j(t,x,x_j,\lambda),x_j),\\
\left[C_0^x(\lambda)v\right]_j(t,x) &:= \sum_{k=1}^n \partial_x c_{jk}(t,x,\lambda) v_k(\tau_j(t,x,x_j,\lambda),x_j),\\
\left[C_1^x(\lambda)w\right]_j(t,x) &:= -\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{c_{jk}(t,x,\lambda)}{a_j(x,\lambda)} w_k(\tau_j(t,x,x_j,\lambda),x_j),\\
\left[D_0^t(\lambda)v\right]_j(t,x) &:= \sum_{k\ne j} \int_{x_j}^x \partial_t d_{jk}(t,x,\xi,\lambda) v_k(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),x_j) d\xi,\\
\left[D_0^x(\lambda)v\right]_j(t,x) &:= \sum_{k\ne j} \left[ d_{jk}(t,x,x,\lambda)u_k(t,x) + \int_{x_j}^x \partial_x d_{jk}(t,x,\xi,\lambda) v_k(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi) d\xi \right],\\
\left[D_1^x(\lambda)w\right]_j(t,x) &:= -\sum_{k\ne j} \int_{x_j}^x \frac{d_{jk}(t,x,\xi,\lambda)}{a_j(x,\lambda)} w_k(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi) d\xi.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v) &= D_0^t(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v + \mathcal{D}(\lambda)\left(C_0^t(\lambda)v + \mathcal{C}(\lambda)\partial_t v\right),\\
\partial_t(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 v) &= D_0^t(\lambda)\mathcal{D}(\lambda)v + \mathcal{D}(\lambda)\left(D_0^t(\lambda)v + \mathcal{D}(\lambda)\partial_t v\right),\\
\partial_x(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v) &= D_0^x(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v + D_1^x(\lambda)\left(C_0^t(\lambda)v + \mathcal{C}(\lambda)\partial_t v\right),\\
\partial_x(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 v) &= D_0^x(\lambda)\mathcal{D}(\lambda)v + D_1^x(\lambda)\left(D_0^t(\lambda)v + \mathcal{D}(\lambda)\partial_t v\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We have to show that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $v \in V$ it holds $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)\partial_t v \in U_0$, $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2\partial_t v \in U_0$, $D_1^x(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)\partial_t v \in U_0$, $D_1^x(\lambda)\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\partial_t v \in U_0$ and

$$\|\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)\partial_t v\|_0 + \|\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2\partial_t v\|_0 + \|D_1^x(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)\partial_t v\|_0 + \|D_1^x(\lambda)\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\partial_t v\|_0 \le \text{const}\|v\|_0.$$

Let us start with the term $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2\partial_t v$. We have (cf. (3.25))

$$\left[\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2\partial_t v\right]_j(t,x) = \sum_{l\ne k\ne j} \int_{x_j}^x \int_{x_k}^\xi d_{jkl}(t,x,\xi,\eta,\lambda)\partial_t v_l(\tau_k(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\eta,\lambda),\eta)\, d\eta\, d\xi$$

with $d_{jkl}(t,x,\xi,\eta\lambda) := d_{jk}(t,x,\xi,\lambda)d_{kl}(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\eta)$. Moreover, taking into account (3.1), (3.2) and (3.11), the following identity is true:

$$\frac{d}{d\xi}v_l(\tau_k(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\eta,\lambda),\eta) = \left(\frac{1}{a_j(\xi,\lambda)} - \frac{1}{a_k(\xi,\lambda)}\right)\partial_t v_l(\tau_k(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\eta,\lambda),\eta).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{x_j}^{x}\int_{x_k}^{\xi} d_{jkl}(t,x,\xi,\eta,\lambda)\partial_t v_l(\tau_k(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\eta,\lambda),\eta)d\eta d\xi \\
&= \int_{x_k}^{x}\int_{\eta}^{x_j} \frac{a_j(\xi,\lambda)a_k(\xi,\lambda)}{a_k(\xi,\lambda)-a_j(\xi,\lambda)} d_{jkl}(t,x,\xi,\eta,\lambda)\frac{d}{d\xi}v_l(\tau_k(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\eta,\lambda),\eta)d\xi d\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts in $\xi$, we see that the absolute values of these integrals can be estimated by a constant times $\|v\|_0$, where the constant does not depend on $x$, $t$ and $\lambda$.

Now, let us consider the term $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)\partial_t v$. We have (cf. (3.23) and (3.25))

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left[\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)\partial_t v\right]_j(t,x) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{k=1\\k\neq j}}^{m}\sum_{l=m+1}^{n}\int_{x_j}^{x} d_{jk}(t,x,\xi,\lambda))c_{kl}(\tau_k(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\lambda)\partial_t v_l(\tau_j(\tau_k(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,0,\lambda),0)d\xi \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{k=m+1\\k\neq j}}^{n}\sum_{l=1}^{m}\int_{x_j}^{x} d_{jk}(t,x,\xi,\lambda))c_{kl}(\tau_k(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\lambda)\partial_t v_l(\tau_j(\tau_k(t,x,\xi,\lambda),1,\xi,\lambda),1)d\xi.
\end{aligned}$$

As above, we see that the absolute values of these integrals can be estimated by a constant times $\|v\|_0$, where the constant does not depend on $x$, $t$ and $\lambda$.

Similarly one shows that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0]$ and $v \in V$ we have $D_1^x(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)\partial_t v \in U_0$, $D_1^x(\lambda)\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\partial_t v \in U_0$ and $\|D_1^x(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)\partial_t v\|_0 + \|D_1^x(\lambda)\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\partial_t v\|_0 \le \mathrm{const}\|v\|_0$. □

**Corollary 3.11** *For all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_1]$ the following is true:*
*(i) The operator $I-\mathcal{C}(\lambda)-\mathcal{D}(\lambda)$ is Fredholm of index zero from $U_0$ to $U_0$.*
*(ii)* $\ker(I-\mathcal{C}(\lambda)-\mathcal{D}(\lambda)) \subset V$.

**Proof.** The assertions (i) and (ii) follow from the assertions (i) and (ii) of Lemma B.1, respectively. □

**Lemma 3.12** *The operator $I-\mathcal{C}(0)-\mathcal{D}(0)$ is injective.*

**Proof.** Suppose $(I-\mathcal{C}(0)-\mathcal{D}(0))u = 0$ for some $u \in U_0$. Then $u \in V$ by Corollary 3.11(ii). Hence, $u$ is a solution of the linearized problem (3.7). But, by the assumption of Theorem 3.1, this problem does not have nontrivial solutions. □

**Corollary 3.13** *For all nonnegative integers $l$ it holds $u_0 \in U_l$.*

**Proof.** Because of Lemma 3.4 the map $F_0 : \mathbb{R} \times U_0 \to U_0$, which is defined by

$$F_0(s,u) := T(s)(I - C(0,T(-s)u)T(-s)u - D(0,T(-s)u,T(-s)u)),$$

is $C^\infty$-smooth. We have $F_0(s,T(s)u_0) = 0$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, in particular, $F_0(0,u_0) = 0$. Moreover, (3.21) yields $\partial_u F_0(0,u_0) = I - \mathcal{C}(0) - \mathcal{D}(0)$. Hence, from Corollary 3.11(i) and Lemma 3.12 it follows that $\partial_u F_0(0,u_0)$ is an isomorphism from $U_0$ to $U_0$, and the classical implicit function theorem yields that the map $s \approx 0 \mapsto T(s)u_0 \in U_0$ is $C^\infty$-smooth, i.e., $u_0 \in U_l$ for all $l$. □

The following two remarks point at two technicalities of our approach:

**Remark 3.14** The function $v$ is artificially introduced in (3.14)–(3.15): If $(\lambda,u)$ is a solution to (3.14)–(3.15) for some $v$, then it is for any $v$.

For our purposes we use two choices of $v$: $v = u$ and $v = u_0$.

First, in Corollary 3.13 we took $v = u$. Using the facts that $u = T(s)u_0$ is a solution to the equation $u - T(s)\left(C(0,T(-s)u)T(-s)u + D(0,T(-s)u,T(-s)u)\right) = 0$, that the left-hand side of this equation depends smoothly on $s$ and that the linearization of this left-hand side in $u = u_0$, namely

$$\frac{d}{du}[u - C(0,u)u - D(0,u,u)]_{u=u_0} = I - \mathcal{C}(0) - \mathcal{D}(0),$$

is Fredholm of index zero from $U_0$ to $U_0$, we proved that $u_0 \in U_l$ for all $l$. But, unfortunately, we do not know if $\frac{d}{du}[u - C(\lambda,u)u - D(\lambda,u,u)]_{u=u_0}$ is Fredholm of index zero from $U_0$ to $U_0$ for all $\lambda \approx 0$, therefore the choice $v = u$ is not useful for further purposes.

Later on we will take $v = u_0$. Using the already known property that $u_0 \in U_l$ for all $l$, now we can prove that $T(s)\left(C(0,T(-s)u_0)T(-s)u + D(0,T(-s)u,T(-s)u_0)\right)$ depends smoothly on $s$. Moreover, due to Corollary 3.11 the operator

$$\frac{d}{du}[u - C(\lambda,u_0)u - D(\lambda,u,u_0)]_{u=u_0} = I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda) - \mathcal{D}(\lambda)$$

is Fredholm of index zero from $U_0$ to $U_0$. Hence, we can apply Theorem 2.2 to the equation $u = C(\lambda,u_0)u + D(\lambda,u,u_0)$.

**Remark 3.15** If $u$ is a (classical) solution to (1.2)–(1.4), then $u$ is a solution to (3.14)–(3.15) for any $v \in U_0$. But we do not know if the converse is true: If a function $u \in U_0$ solves (3.14)–(3.15) for some (and hence for any) $v \in U_0$, is then $u$ a $C^1$-smooth function, and hence a solution to (1.2)–(1.4)? This is the reason why in Theorem 3.1 we suppose that $u_0$ is a classical solution to (1.2)–(1.4). It seems to be not sufficient to suppose that $u_0$ is only a continuous function satisfying $u_0 - C(\lambda,v)u_0 - D(\lambda,u_0,v) = 0$ for some $v$.

The $C^1$-smoothness of $u_0$ is used in the proof of Lemma 3.9. Because $u_0$ is $C^1$-smooth, the coefficient functions $c_{jk}$, $d_{jk}$ and $d_{jkl}$ are $C^1$-smooth, and therefore one can integrate by parts.

Now we represent the problem (1.2)–(1.4) in the setting of Section 2. Define

$$F : [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times U_0 \to U_0 : \ F(\lambda, u) := u - C(\lambda, u_0)u - D(\lambda, u, u_0).$$

Then, on the account of Lemma 3.4 and Corollary 3.13, the map

$$(s, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times U_0 \mapsto \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, u) := T(s)F(\lambda, T(-s)u) \in U_0$$

is $C^\infty$-smooth for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$, i.e., the condition (2.3) is fulfilled. Moreover, using the definitions (3.12), (3.17) and (3.18), it is easy to show that the conditions (2.4) and (2.5) are fulfilled. Further, Lemma 3.11 (i) yields the condition (2.8). And finally, Lemmas 3.10, 3.12 and B.1 and Remark B.2 (with $U := U_0$) imply the condition (2.9). Hence, Theorem 2.2 can be applied to the equation $u = C(\lambda, u_0)u - D(\lambda, u, u_0)$, and this gives the assertions of Theorem 3.1.

## 3.3 More general boundary conditions

Theorem 3.1 can be generalized to more general boundary conditions of the type

$$\begin{aligned} u_j(t,0) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left( r_{jk}^{00}(t,\lambda)u_k(t,0) + r_{jk}^{01}(t,\lambda)u_k(t,1) \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \\ u_j(t,1) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left( r_{jk}^{10}(t,\lambda)u_k(t,0) + r_{jk}^{11}(t,\lambda)u_k(t,1) \right), \quad j = m+1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

Here $r_{jk}^{\alpha\beta} : \mathbb{R} \times [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \to \mathbb{R}$ are $C^\infty$-smooth and $2\pi$-periodic with respect to time.

Reflection boundary conditions of the type (1.3) appear, for example, in semiconductor laser modeling (see [25, 28, 29, 33]). Boundary conditions of the type (3.36) appear, for example, in boundary feedback control problems, see [27] for applications.

If (1.3) is replaced by (3.36), then (3.14)–(3.15) is replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} u_j(t,x) = c_j(t,x,0,\lambda,v) &\sum_{k=1}^{n} \big( r_{jk}^{00}(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda),\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda),0) \\ &+ r_{jk}^{01}(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda),\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda),1) \big) \\ &+ \int_0^x \frac{c_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda,v)}{a_j(\xi,\lambda)} f_j(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\lambda,u(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi),v(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi)d\xi \\ &\text{for } j = 1, \dots, m, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} u_j(t,x) = c_j(t,x,1,\lambda,v) &\sum_{k=1}^{m} \big( r_{jk}^{10}(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),0) \\ &+ r_{jk}^{11}(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),1) \big) \\ &- \int_x^1 \frac{c_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda,v)}{a_j(\xi,\lambda)} f_j(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi,\lambda,u(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi),v(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi)d\xi \\ &\text{for } j = m+1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

and (3.23) is replaced by

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)u\right)_j(t,x) &= c_j(t,x,0,\lambda,u_0)\sum_{k=1}^{n}\big(r_{jk}^{00}(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda),\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda),0)\\ &\quad + r_{jk}^{01}(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda),\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,0,\lambda),1)\big) \text{ for } j=1,\dots,m,\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)u\right)_j(t,x) &= c_j(t,x,1,\lambda,u_0)\sum_{k=1}^{n}\big(r_{jk}^{10}(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),0)\\ &\quad + r_{jk}^{11}(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),\lambda)u_k(\tau_j(t,x,1,\lambda),1)\big) \text{ for } j=m+1,\dots,n.\end{aligned}$$

In order to have a replacement for Lemma 3.7, we need that there exist $\varepsilon_1 \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$ and $d>0$ such that for all $\lambda\in[-\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_1]$ the operator $I-\mathcal{C}(\lambda)$ is bijective from $U_0$ to $U_0$ and $\|(I-\mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_0)}\le d$. A sufficient condition (which is far from being necessary) for that is

$$\|\mathcal{C}(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_0)} \le \text{const} < 1 \text{ for all } \lambda \approx 0. \tag{3.37}$$

Remark that the condition $\|\mathcal{C}(0)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_0)}<1$ for all $\lambda\approx 0$ is not sufficient for (3.37), in general, because the map $\lambda\mapsto\mathcal{C}(\lambda)$ is not continuous with respect to the uniform operator norm in $\mathcal{L}(U_0)$, in general. But another "$\lambda$-independent" condition is sufficient for (3.37), namely

$$\begin{aligned}&\max_{t,x} c_j(t,x,0,0,u_0)\sum_{k=1}^{n}\Big(\max_t|r_{jk}^{00}(t,0)|+\max_t|r_{jk}^{01}(t,0)|\Big)<1 \qquad \text{for } j=1,\dots,m,\\ &\max_{t,x} c_j(t,x,1,0,u_0)\sum_{k=1}^{n}\Big(\max_t|r_{jk}^{10}(t,0)|+\max_t|r_{jk}^{11}(t,0)|\Big)<1 \qquad \text{for } j=m+1,\dots,n.\end{aligned}$$

But the definition (3.12) yields that $c_j(t,x,0,0,u_0)\le 1$ for $j=1,\dots,m$ and $c_j(t,x,1,0,u_0)\le 1$ for $j=m+1,\dots,n$ if

$$\begin{aligned}&\min_{t,x}\frac{\partial_{u_j}b_j(t,x,u_0(t,x),0)}{a_j(x,0)}>0 \text{ for } j=1,\dots,m,\\ &\max_{t,x}\frac{\partial_{u_j}b_j(t,x,u_0(t,x),0)}{a_j(x,0)}<0 \text{ for } j=m+1,\dots,n.\end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

Therefore, if (3.38) is true and if

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{k=1}^{n}\Big(\max_t|r_{jk}^{00}(t,0)|+\max_t|r_{jk}^{01}(t,0)|\Big)<1 \qquad \text{for } j=1,\dots,m,\\ &\sum_{k=1}^{n}\Big(\max_t|r_{jk}^{10}(t,0)|+\max_t|r_{jk}^{11}(t,0)|\Big)<1 \qquad \text{for } j=m+1,\dots,n,\end{aligned}$$

then (3.37) is true.

# 4 Time-periodic solutions to second-order hyperbolic equations

## 4.1 Setting and main result

In this section we consider the boundary value problem (1.5)–(1.7), where the coefficient functions $a : [0,1] \times [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \to \mathbb{R}$ and $b : \mathbb{R} \times [0,1] \times [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ are $C^\infty$-smooth, $b$ is $2\pi$-periodic in $t$ and

$$a(x,\lambda) > 0 \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R},\ x \in [0,1] \text{ and } \lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]. \tag{4.1}$$

Speaking about solutions to (1.5)–(1.7), we will mean classical solutions again.

Let $u_0$ be a solution to (1.5)–(1.7) with $\lambda = 0$. Denote

$$\begin{array}{rcl} b_0(t,x) & := & \partial_4 b(t,x,0,u_0(x,t),\partial_t u_0(t,x),\partial_x u_0(t,x)), \\ b_1(t,x) & := & \partial_5 b(t,x,0,u_0(t,x),\partial_t u_0(t,x),\partial_x u_0(t,x)), \\ b_2(t,x) & := & \partial_6 b(t,x,0,u_0(t,x),\partial_t u_0(t,x),\partial_x u_0(t,x)) \end{array} \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} R_0(t) := & \int_0^1 \frac{1}{a(\eta,0)} \left( b_1\left(t - \int_0^\eta \frac{dx}{a(x,0)}, \eta\right) + b_1\left(t + \int_0^\eta \frac{dx}{a(x,0)}, \eta\right)\right) d\eta \\ & + \int_0^1 \frac{1}{a(\eta,0)^2} \left( b_2\left(t - \int_0^\eta \frac{dx}{a(x,0)}, \eta\right) - b_2\left(t + \int_0^\eta \frac{dx}{a(x,0)}, \eta\right)\right) d\eta, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_0(t) := & \int_0^1 \frac{1}{a(\eta,0)} \left( b_1\left(t + \int_\eta^1 \frac{dx}{a(x,0)}, \eta\right) + b_1\left(t - \int_\eta^1 \frac{dx}{a(x,0)}, \eta\right)\right) d\eta \\ & + \int_0^1 \frac{1}{a(\eta,0)^2} \left( b_2\left(t + \int_\eta^1 \frac{dx}{a(x,0)}, \eta\right) - b_2\left(t - \int_\eta^1 \frac{dx}{a(x,0)}, \eta\right)\right) d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Here and in what follows we denote by $\partial_j b$ ($j = 4,5,6$) the partial derivative of $b$ with respect to the $j$-th argument, i.e., with respect to $u$ for $j = 4$, with respect to $\partial_t u$ for $j = 5$ and with respect to $\partial_x u$ for $j = 6$.

**Theorem 4.1** *Suppose (4.1) and*

$$R_0(t) \neq 0 \text{ for all } t \text{ or } S_0(t) \neq 0 \text{ for all } t. \tag{4.3}$$

*Assume that the linearized problem*

$$\begin{array}{r} \partial_t^2 u - a(x,0)^2 \partial_x^2 u + b_0(t,x)u + b_1(t,x)\partial_t u + b_2(t,x)\partial_x u = 0, \\ u(t+2\pi,x) = u(t,x), \\ u(t,0) = \partial_x u(t,1) = 0 \end{array} \tag{4.4}$$

*does not have a solution $u \neq 0$.*

*Then there exist $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta > 0$ and a $C^\infty$-map $\hat{u} : \mathbb{R} \times [0,1] \times [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that the following is true:*

*(i) For all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$ the function $\hat{u}(\cdot, \cdot, \lambda)$ is a solution to (1.5)–(1.7).*

*(ii) If $u$ is a solution to (1.5)–(1.7) with*

$$|\lambda| + \max_{t,x} |u(x,t) - u_0(t,x)| + \max_{t,x} |\partial_t u(x,t) - \partial_t u_0(t,x)| + \max_{t,x} |\partial_x u(x,t) - \partial_x u_0(t,x)| < \delta,$$

*then $u(t,x) = \hat{u}(t,x,\lambda)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in [0,1]$. In particular, $u_0 = \hat{u}(\cdot, \cdot, 0)$ is $C^\infty$-smooth.*

**Remark 4.2** Special cases of equations of the type (1.5) are nonlinear telegraph equations of the type

$$\partial_t^2 u - a(x,\lambda)^2 \partial_x^2 u + a_1(x,\lambda)\partial_t u + a_2(x,\lambda)\partial_x u + b(t,x,\lambda,u) = 0$$

with $a(x,\lambda) > 0$ and $a_1(x,\lambda) > 0$. Then

$$R_0(t) = S_0(t) = 2\int_0^1 \frac{a_1(x,0)}{a(x,0)} dx \neq 0,$$

i.e. assumption (4.3) is fulfilled independently of the choice of the functions $a_2$ and $b$ and of the starting solution $u_0$.

**Remark 4.3** Let us mention some results related to Theorem 4.1.

In [30] P. H. Rabinowitz investigated fully nonlinear dissipative wave equations of the type

$$\partial_t^2 u - \partial_x^2 u + a_0 \partial_t u + \lambda b(t,x,u,\partial_t u, \partial_x u, \partial_t^2, \partial_t \partial_x u, \partial_x^2) = 0,\ x \in (0,1)$$

with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. By means of Nash-Moser iterations it was shown that under natural assumptions for all $\lambda \approx 0$ there exists a time-periodic solution close to zero. Using Schauder's fixed point theorem, M. Štědrý [34] generalized this result to the case of bounded domains of any dimension and to differential operators of higher order in $x$. Both authors did not consider the question of smoothness of the data-to-solution map and the question of time-periodic solutions far from zero.

In [7] W. Craig considered fully nonlinear dissipative wave equations of the type

$$\partial_t^2 u - \partial_x^2 u + a_0 \partial_t u - (\lambda_0 + \lambda)u + b(t,x,u,\partial_t u, \partial_x u, \partial_t^2 u, \partial_t \partial_x u, \partial_x^2 u) = 0,\ x \in (0,1)$$

with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions (as well as their analogues with higher space dimension), where $b(t,x,\cdot)$ is at least of quadratic order. It was shown (by means of a Liapunov-Schmidt reduction and Nash-Moser iterations) that under natural assumptions there exists a branch of non-trivial time-periodic solutions bifurcating at $\lambda = 0$ from the solution $u = 0$, which can be Lipschitz continuously parameterized by $\lambda \approx 0$.

In [14, 15] J. Hale and G. Raugel considered systems of damped autonomous wave equations of the type

$$\partial_t^2 u_j - \Delta u_j + (a_0 + \lambda a_1(x))\partial_t u_j + a_2 u_j + b_j(u) = 0,\ x \in \Omega,\ j = 1,2$$

with homogeneous Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions in an $n$-dimensional bounded domain $\Omega$. By means of the Leray-Schauder fixed point theorem it was shown that under natural assumptions a non-degenerate periodic orbit persists uniquely under small perturbations of $\lambda$. The question of smoothness of the data-to-solution map was not addressed.

In [24] A. Yu. Kolesov and N. Ch. Rozov proved existence of small time-periodic solutions to parametrically excited damped wave equations of the type

$$\partial_t^2 u + \varepsilon \partial_t u + (1 + \varepsilon\alpha \cos 2\omega t)u = \varepsilon^2 a^2 \partial_x^2 u + f(u, \partial_t u),\ x \in (0, \pi)$$

with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, where $0 < \varepsilon << 1$ is a small singular perturbation parameter, and $f$ and its first partial derivatives vanish at zero.

Of course, if assumption (4.3) is dropped, then one should expect a solution behavior which is completely different to Theorem 4.1, see, for example, the results of M. Berti and M. Procesi in [5] on periodically forced completely resonant nonlinear wave equations.

**Remark 4.4** It is known how to prove a so-called $G$-invariant implicit function theorems for equivariant equations by means of classical implicit function theorems (see, e.g. [8]) and how to apply this to periodic solutions of autonomous evolution equations. Hence, Theorem 2.2 can be translated into an equivariant setting (i.e. with $T(s)F(\lambda, u) = F(\lambda, T(s)u)$ for all $s, \lambda, u$), and Theorems 3.1 and 4.1 can be translated into an autonomous setting (in this case the local uniqueness assertion should be understood modulo time shifts, of course), this will be done in [23].

There is an essential difference between the autonomous and the nonautonomous cases. In the nonautonomous case the proof of smoothness of the data-to-solution map is essentially simpler if one assumes that the coefficient $a(x, \lambda)$ is $\lambda$-independent (cf. Remark 3.5). This simplification does not occur in the autonomous case, i.e., for equations of the type

$$\partial_t^2 u - a(x, \lambda)^2 \partial_x^2 u + b(x, \lambda, u, \partial_t u, \partial_x u) = 0.$$

The reason is that one should scale the time in order to work in spaces of periodic functions with fixed period. Then, after time scaling, the unknown frequency $\tau$ appears explicitely in the main part of the equation, namely

$$\tau^2 \partial_t^2 u - a(x, \lambda)^2 \partial_x^2 u + b(x, \lambda, u, \tau\partial_t u, \partial_x u) = 0,$$

and this way a coefficient dependence appears in the main part of the differential operator even if $a(x, \lambda)$ is $\lambda$-independent.

## 4.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

In this subsection we will prove Theorem 4.1, hence we will suppose that all its assumptions are fulfilled.

Denote by $U_0$ the space of all continuous maps $v : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $v(\cdot, x)$ is $2\pi$-periodic, with the norm

$$\|v\|_0 := \max_{j=1,2} \max_{t,x} |v_j(t, x)|.$$

Given $v \in U_0$, write

$$\begin{aligned}(J_0^\lambda v)(t,x) &:= \frac{1}{2}\int_0^x \frac{v_1(t,\xi)-v_2(t,\xi)}{a(\xi,\lambda)}d\xi,\\ (J_1 v)(t,x) &:= \frac{v_1(t,x)+v_2(t,x)}{2},\\ (J_2^\lambda v)(t,x) &:= \frac{v_1(t,x)-v_2(t,x)}{2a(x,\lambda)}.\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.5** *(i) Let $u$ be a solution to (1.5)–(1.7). Then the pair*

$$v_1(t,x) := \partial_t u(t,x) + a(x,\lambda)\partial_x u(t,x),\ v_2(t,x) := \partial_t u(t,x) - a(x,\lambda)\partial_x u(t,x) \tag{4.5}$$

*is a solution to*

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t v_1 - a(x,\lambda)\partial_x v_1 = \partial_t v_2 + a(x,\lambda)\partial_x v_2\\ &= -\frac{\partial_x a(x,\lambda)}{2}(v_1-v_2) - b\left(t,x,\lambda,J_0^\lambda v, J_1 v, J_2^\lambda v\right), &(4.6)\\ &v_1(t+2\pi,x) - v_1(t,x) = v_2(t+2\pi,x) - v_2(t,x) = 0, &(4.7)\\ &v_1(t,0) + v_2(t,0) = v_1(t,1) - v_2(t,1) = 0. &(4.8)\end{aligned}$$

*(ii) Let $v = (v_1, v_2)$ be a solution to (4.6)-(4.8). Then $u = J_0^\lambda v$ is a solution to (1.5)–(1.7).*

**Proof.** (i) From (4.5) it follows $\partial_t v_1 = \partial_t^2 u + a\partial_t\partial_x u$ and $\partial_x v_1 = \partial_t\partial_x u + \partial_x a\partial_x u + a\partial_x^2 u$. Hence, (1.5) yields

$$\partial_t v_1 - a(x,\lambda)\partial_x v_1 = -a(x,\lambda)\partial_x a(x,\lambda)\partial_x u - b\left(t,x,\lambda,u,\partial_t u,\partial_x u\right). \tag{4.9}$$

But (4.5) yields also $2a\partial_x u = v_1 - v_2$. Hence, (1.7) implies $u = J_0^\lambda v$. Inserting this into (4.9), we get the first equation from (4.6). The second one can be proved analogously. Finally, the boundary conditions (4.8) follow directly from the boundary conditions (1.7).

(ii) From (4.6) it follows $\partial_t(v_1 - v_2) = a\partial_x(v_1 + v_2)$. Hence, (4.8) and $u = J_0^\lambda v$ yield $2\partial_t u(t,x) = \int_0^x (\partial_x v_1(t,\xi) + \partial_x v_2(t,\xi))d\xi = v_1(t,x) + v_2(t,x)$, i.e.

$$2\partial_t^2 u(t,x) = \partial_t v_1(t,x) + \partial_t v_2(t,x). \tag{4.10}$$

Moreover, from $u = J_0^\lambda v$ follows $2a\partial_x u = v_1 - v_2$, i.e.

$$2a(x,\lambda)\partial_x^2 u = \partial_x v_1 - \partial_x v_2 - 2\partial_x a(x,\lambda)\partial_x u. \tag{4.11}$$

But (4.6), (4.10) and (4.11) imply (1.5). Finally, (4.8) and $u = J_0^\lambda v$ yield (1.7). □

Now we proceed as in Section 3.2. The characteristics of the hyperbolic system (4.6) are given by (cf. (3.11))

$$\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda) := t + (-1)^j \int_x^\xi \frac{d\eta}{a(\eta,\lambda)}. \tag{4.12}$$

Let us introduce an artificial linear diagonal term (which depends on a function $w \in U_0$) and rewrite the system (4.6) as (cf. (3.13))

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t v_1 - a(x,\lambda)\partial_x v_1 + \left(\frac{\partial_x a(x,\lambda)}{2} + \tilde{b}_1(t,x,\lambda,w)\right) v_1 = f_1(t,x,\lambda,v,w),\\
&\partial_t v_2 + a(x,\lambda)\partial_x v_2 + \left(-\frac{\partial_x a(x,\lambda)}{2} + \tilde{b}_1(t,x,\lambda,w)\right) v_2 = f_2(t,x,\lambda,v,w)
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{b}_j(t,x,\lambda,w) &:= \frac{1}{2}\partial_5 b\left(t,x,\lambda,J_0^\lambda w(t,x), J_1 w(t,x), J_2^\lambda w(t,x)\right)\\
&\quad -\frac{(-1)^j}{2a(x,\lambda)}\partial_6 b\left(t,x,\lambda,J_0^\lambda w(t,x), J_1 w(t,x), J_2^\lambda w(t,x)\right), \qquad (4.13)\\
f_1(t,x,\lambda,v,w) &:= \frac{\partial_x a(x,\lambda)}{2} v_2(t,x) + \tilde{b}_1(t,x,\lambda,w) v_1(t,x)\\
&\quad -b\left(t,x,\lambda,J_0^\lambda v(t,x), J_1 v(t,x), J_2^\lambda v(t,x)\right), \qquad (4.14)\\
f_2(t,x,\lambda,v,w) &:= -\frac{\partial_x a(x,\lambda)}{2} v_1(t,x) + \tilde{b}_2(t,x,\lambda,w) v_2(t,x)\\
&\quad -b\left(t,x,\lambda,J_0^\lambda v(t,x), J_1 v(t,x), J_2^\lambda v(t,x)\right). \qquad (4.15)
\end{aligned}$$

Remark that now the partial derivatives $\partial_{v_j} f_j(t,x,\lambda,v,w)|_{v=w}$ do not vanish like in Section 3.2, but they are good enough for our purposes, since they are integral operators:

$$\partial_{v_j} f_j(t,x,\lambda,v,w)|_{v=w}\bar{v}_j = -\frac{(-1)^j}{2}\partial_4 b\left(t,x,\lambda,J_0^\lambda w(t,x), J_1 w(t,x), J_2^\lambda w(t,x)\right)\int_0^x \bar{v}_j(\xi)d\xi.$$

Moreover, the coefficients $c_j$ (cf. (3.12)) read

$$\begin{aligned}
c_1(t,x,\xi,\lambda,w) &:= \exp\int_x^\xi \left(-\frac{\partial_x a(\eta,\lambda)}{2a(\eta,\lambda)} - \frac{\tilde{b}_1(\tau_1(t,x,\eta,\lambda),\eta,\lambda,w)}{a(\eta,\lambda)}\right)d\eta\\
&= \sqrt{\frac{a(x,\lambda)}{a(\xi,\lambda)}}\exp\int_\xi^x \frac{\tilde{b}_1(\tau_1(t,x,\eta,\lambda),\eta,\lambda,w)}{a(\eta,\lambda)}d\eta, \qquad (4.16)\\
c_2(t,x,\xi,\lambda,w) &:= \exp\int_x^\xi \left(-\frac{\partial_x a(\eta,\lambda)}{2a(\eta,\lambda)} + \frac{\tilde{b}_2(\tau_2(t,x,\eta,\lambda),\eta,\lambda,w)}{a(\eta,\lambda)}\right)d\eta\\
&= \sqrt{\frac{a(x,\lambda)}{a(\xi,\lambda)}}\exp\int_x^\xi \frac{\tilde{b}_2(\tau_2(t,x,\eta,\lambda),\eta,\lambda,w)}{a(\eta,\lambda)}d\eta. \qquad (4.17)
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.6** *The pair $v = (v_1, v_2)$ satisfies (4.6)-(4.8) if and only if*

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(t,x) &= c_1(t,x,0,\lambda,w)v_2(\tau_1(t,x,0,\lambda),0) \\ &\quad + \int_0^x \frac{c_1(t,x,\xi,\lambda,w)}{a(\xi,\lambda)} f_1(t,x,\xi,\lambda,v,w)d\xi, \qquad (4.18) \\ v_2(t,x) &= c_2(t,x,1,\lambda,w)v_1(\tau_2(t,x,1,\lambda,w),1) \\ &\quad + \int_x^1 \frac{c_2(t,x,\xi,\lambda,w)}{a(\xi,\lambda)} f_2(t,x,\xi,\lambda,v,w)d\xi \qquad (4.19) \end{aligned}$$

*for any $w \in U_1$.*

**Proof.** The proof can be done by means of integration along characteristics like in Section 3.2 for getting equivalence of the PDE problem (1.2)-(1.4) and the system of integral equations (3.14)-(3.15). □

Now, for $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $w \in U_0$ we define linear bounded operators $C(\lambda, w) : U_0 \to U_0$ (cf. (3.17)) by

$$\left(C(\lambda,w)v\right)_j(t,x) := \begin{cases} c_1(t,x,0,\lambda,w)v_2(\tau_1(t,x,0,\lambda),0) \text{ for } j=1, \\ -c_2(t,x,1,\lambda,w)v_1(\tau_2(t,x,1,\lambda),1) \text{ for } j=2 \end{cases} \qquad (4.20)$$

and $C^\infty$-smooth nonlinear operators $D(\lambda,\cdot,\cdot) : U_0 \times U_0 \to U_0$ (cf. (3.18)) by

$$D(\lambda,v,w)_j(t,x) := (-1)^j \int_{x_j}^x \frac{c_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda,w)}{a(\xi,\lambda)} f_j(\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda),x,\xi,\lambda,v,w)d\xi \qquad (4.21)$$

with $x_1 := 0$ and $x_2 := 1$. Using this notation, system (4.18)–(4.19) can be written as the operator equation

$$v = C(\lambda,w)v + D(\lambda,v,w). \qquad (4.22)$$

Let us introduce a $C_0$-group $T(s)$ on $U_0$ by $\left(T(s)v\right)(t,x) := v(t+s,x)$. The corresponding infinitesimal generator is $A := \partial_t$, and the domains of definition of the powers $A^l$ are

$$U_l := \{v \in U_0 : \ \partial_j^t v \in U_0 \text{ for all } j = 0,1,\ldots,l\}.$$

They are Banach spaces with the norms

$$\|v\|_l := \sum_{j=0}^{l} \|\partial_t^j v\|_0.$$

**Lemma 4.7** *The maps $(s,v,w) \in \mathbb{R} \times U_0^2 \mapsto T(s)C(\lambda, T(-s)w)T(-s)v \in U_0$ and $(s,v,w) \in \mathbb{R}\times U_0^2 \mapsto T(s)D(\lambda, T(-s)v, T(-s)w) \in U_0$ are $C^\infty$-smooth for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$.*

**Proof.** Because of $(J_0^\lambda T(s)v)(t,x) = (J_0^\lambda v)(t+s,x)$, $(J_1 T(s)v)(t,x) = (J_1 v)(t+s,x)$ and $(J_2^\lambda T(s)v)(t,x) = (J_2^\lambda v)(t+s,x)$, the proof follows the same line as the proof of Lemma 3.4. □

Define the function $v_0 \in U_0$ by

$$v_0(t,x) := (\partial_t u_0(t,x) + a(x,0)\partial_x u_0(t,x), \partial_t u_0(t,x) - a(x,0)\partial_x u_0(t,x))$$

and, for $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$, the operators $\mathcal{C}(\lambda), \mathcal{D}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{L}(U_0)$ by

$$\mathcal{C}(\lambda) := C(\lambda, v_0),\ \mathcal{D}(\lambda) := \partial_v D(\lambda, v, v_0)|_{v=v_0}. \tag{4.23}$$

Because of (4.20) the operator $\mathcal{C}(\lambda)$ is of "argument shift type" with vanishing diagonal part:

$$\left(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v\right)_j(t,x) = \begin{cases} -c_1(t,x,0,\lambda,v_0)v_2(\tau_1(t,x,0,\lambda),0) \text{ for } j=1, \\ c_2(t,x,1,\lambda,v_0)v_1(\tau_2(t,x,1,\lambda),1) \text{ for } j=2. \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 4.8** *There exist $\varepsilon_1 \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$ and $d>0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_1]$ the operator $I-\mathcal{C}(\lambda)$ is bijective from $U_0$ to $U_0$ and $\|(I-\mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_0)} \le d$.*

**Proof.** This is Lemma 3.7 with $m=1, n=2$ and with $r_{12}(t,\lambda) = -1, r_{21}(t,\lambda) = 1$, and hence with $c_{12}(t,x,\lambda)$ replaced by

$$-c_1(t,x,0,\lambda,v_0) = -\sqrt{\frac{a(x,\lambda)}{a(0,\lambda)}}\exp\int_0^x \frac{\tilde{b}_1(\tau_1(t,x,\eta,\lambda),\eta,\lambda,v_0)}{a(\eta,\lambda)}d\eta,$$

and with $c_{21}(t,x,\lambda)$ replaced by

$$c_2(t,x,1,\lambda,v_0) = \sqrt{\frac{a(x,\lambda)}{a(1,\lambda)}}\exp\int_x^1 \frac{\tilde{b}_2(\tau_2(t,x,\eta,\lambda),\eta,\lambda,v_0)}{a(\eta,\lambda)}d\eta,$$

cf. (4.16) and (4.17). This means that the condition $|c_{12}(t,1,0)c_{21}(\tau_1(t,1,0,0),0,0)| \neq 1$ (see (3.34)) now reads

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\tilde{b}_1(\tau_1(t,1,\eta,0),\eta,0,v_0) + \tilde{b}_2(\tau_2(\tau_1(t,1,0,0),0,\eta,0),\eta,0,v_0)}{a(\eta,0)}d\eta \neq 0 \text{ for all } t.$$

On the account of (4.2) and (4.13), this is equivalent to

$$\int_0^1 \left(b_1(\tau_1(t,1,\eta,0),\eta) + b_1(\tau_2(\tau_1(t,1,0,0),0,\eta,0),\eta)\right)d\eta$$
$$+ \int_0^1 \frac{b_2(\tau_1(t,1,\eta,0),\eta) - b_2(\tau_2(\tau_1(t,1,0,0),0,\eta,0),\eta)}{a(\eta,0)}d\eta \neq 0 \text{ for all } t,$$

and, because of (4.12), this is equivalent to $R_0(t) \neq 0$ for all $t$.

Similarly one shows that the condition $|c_{21}(t,0,0)c_{12}(\tau_2(t,0,1,0),1,0)| \neq 1$ from Lemma 3.7 with $m=1, n=2$ should be replaced by $S_0(t) \neq 0$. □

Because of (4.13)–(4.15) and (4.21) the operator $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)$ is the sum of two integral operators

$$\mathcal{D}(\lambda) = \mathcal{G}(\lambda) + \mathcal{H}(\lambda),$$

where

$$\left(\mathcal{G}(\lambda)v\right)_j(t,x) := \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_0^x g_1(t,x,\xi,\lambda)v_2(\tau_1(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi)d\xi \text{ for } j=1, \\ \displaystyle\int_x^1 g_2(t,x,\xi,\lambda)v_1(\tau_2(t,x,\xi,\lambda),\xi)d\xi \text{ for } j=2 \end{cases}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} g_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda) \;:=\; & (-1)^j \frac{c_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda,v_0)}{2a(\xi,\lambda)} \Big[\partial_5 b(\tau,x,\xi,\lambda,J_0^\lambda v_0(\tau,x),J_1 v_0(\tau,x),J_2^\lambda v_0(\tau,x)) \\ & - \frac{\partial_6 b(\tau,x,\xi,\lambda,J_0^\lambda v_0(\tau,x),J_1 v_0^\lambda(\tau,x),J_2^\lambda v_0(\tau,x))}{a(\xi,\lambda)}\Big]_{\tau=\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda)} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left(\mathcal{H}(\lambda)v\right)_j(t,x) := \int_x^{x_j}\int_0^\xi h_j(t,x,\xi,\eta,\lambda)\left(v_1(\tau_j(t,x,\eta,\lambda),\eta)+v_2(\tau_j(t,x,\eta,\lambda),\eta)\right)d\eta d\xi$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} & h_j(t,x,\xi,\eta,\lambda) \\ & := \frac{(-1)^j c_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda,v_0)}{2a(\xi,\lambda)}\Big[\partial_4 b(\tau,x,\xi,\lambda,J_0^\lambda v_0(\tau,x),J_1 v_0(\tau,x),J_2^\lambda v_0(\tau,x))\Big]_{\tau=\tau_j(t,x,\xi,\lambda)}. \end{aligned}$$

The operator $\mathcal{G}(\lambda)$ is a so-called partial integral operator (with one integration only, but working on functions with two arguments, cf. [3]) with vanishing diagonal part, while the operator $\mathcal{H}(\lambda)$ is an integral operator.

Finally, let us introduce the Banach space $V$ with the norm $\|\cdot\|_V$ and the Hilbert space $H$ with the scalar product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & V := \{v\in U_0 :\ \partial_t v, \partial_x v \in U_0\},\ \|v\|_V := \|v\|_0 + \|\partial_t v\|_0 + \|\partial_x v\|_0, \\ & H := L^2\left((0,1)\times(0,2\pi);\mathbb{R}^2\right),\ \langle v,w\rangle := \int_0^{2\pi}\int_0^1 v(t,x)w(t,x)dxdt. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.9** *It holds*

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0}\sup_{\|v\|_0\le 1}\langle\left(\mathcal{C}(\lambda)+\mathcal{D}(\lambda)-\mathcal{C}(0)-\mathcal{D}(0)\right)v,w\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } w\in H.$$

**Proof.** We follow the proof of Lemma 3.9. In particular, the scalar product $\langle\mathcal{H}(\lambda)v,w\rangle$ equals

$$\sum_{j=1}^2\int_0^1\int_x^{x_j}\int_0^\xi\int_0^{2\pi} h_j(t,x,\xi,\eta,\lambda)\Big[v_1(\tau,\eta)+v_2(\tau,\eta)\Big]_{\tau=\tau_j(t,x,\eta,\lambda)} w_j(t,x)dtd\eta d\xi dx.$$

Hence, the change of the integration variables $t \mapsto s$ by means of $t = t_j(\tau_j(s, x, \eta, 0), x, \eta, \lambda)$ yields

$$\lim_{\lambda \to 0} \sup_{\|v\|_0 \le 1} \langle (\mathcal{H}(\lambda) - \mathcal{H}(0))\, v, w \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } w \in H.$$

□

**Lemma 4.10** *There exists $d > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $v \in V$ it holds $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 v \in V$, $\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v \in V$ and*

$$\|\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 v\|_V + \|\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v\|_V \le d\|v\|_0.$$

**Proof.** As in the proof of Lemma 3.10, one can show that there exists $d > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $v \in V$ it holds $\mathcal{G}(\lambda)^2 v \in V$, $\mathcal{G}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v \in V$ and

$$\|\mathcal{G}(\lambda)^2 v\|_V + \|\mathcal{G}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v\|_V \le d\|v\|_0.$$

Hence, it remains to show that there exists $d > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $v \in V$ it holds $\mathcal{H}(\lambda)v \in V$ and

$$\|\mathcal{H}(\lambda)v\|_V \le d\|v\|_0. \tag{4.24}$$

To this end, consider $(\mathcal{H}(\lambda)v)_1(t, x)$ (and similarly for $(\mathcal{H}(\lambda)v)_2(t, x)$):

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathcal{H}(\lambda)v)_1(t, x) \\
&= -\int_0^x \int_0^\xi h_j(t, x, \xi, \eta, \lambda)\, (v_1(\tau_1(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \eta) + v_2(\tau_1(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \eta))\, d\eta d\xi \\
&= -\int_0^x \int_\eta^x h_j(t, x, \xi, \eta, \lambda)\, (v_1(\tau_1(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \eta) + v_2(\tau_1(t, x, \xi, \lambda), \eta))\, d\xi d\eta \\
&= \int_0^x \int_\eta^x a(\tau(t, x, \zeta, \lambda), \lambda) h_j(t, x, \tau(t, x, \zeta, \lambda), \eta, \lambda)\, (v_1(\zeta, \eta) + v_2(\zeta, \eta))\, d\zeta d\eta
\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

Here we used the change of variables $\xi \mapsto \zeta$ via

$$\zeta = \tau_1(t, x, \xi, \lambda) = t - \int_x^\xi \frac{d\eta}{a(\eta, \lambda)},$$

and introduced the function $\tau(t, x, \cdot, \lambda)$ as the inverse to $\tau_1(t, x, \cdot, \lambda)$. From (4.25) it follows

$$|(\mathcal{H}(\lambda)v)_1(t, x)| + |\partial_t(\mathcal{H}(\lambda)v)_1(t, x)| + |\partial_x(\mathcal{H}(\lambda)v)_1(t, x)| \le \text{const}\|v\|_0,$$

where the constant does not depend on $t, x$, $\lambda \approx 0$ and $v$. This implies (4.24) as desired. □

Now from Lemma B.1 it follows

**Corollary 4.11** *For all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1]$ the following is true:*
*(i) The operator $I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda) - \mathcal{D}(\lambda)$ is Fredholm of index zero from $U_0$ into $U_0$.*
*(ii)* $\ker(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda) - \mathcal{D}(\lambda)) \subset V$.

**Lemma 4.12** *The operator $I - \mathcal{C}(0) - \mathcal{D}(0)$ is injective.*

**Proof.** Suppose $(I - \mathcal{C}(0) - \mathcal{D}(0))v = 0$ for some $v \in U_0$. Then $v \in V$ by Corollary 4.11 (ii). Hence, $u = J_0^\lambda v$ is a solution of the linearized problem (4.4). But by the assumption of Theorem 4.1, the problem (4.4) does not have nontrivial solutions. □

**Corollary 4.13** *For all positive integers $l$ it holds $v_0 \in U_l$.*

**Proof.** Because of Lemma 4.7 the map $F_0 : \mathbb{R} \times U_0 \to U_0$, which is defined by

$$F_0(s, v) := T(s)(I - C(0, T(-s)v)T(-s)v - D(0, T(-s)v, T(-s)v)),$$

is $C^\infty$-smooth. Moreover, it holds $F_0(s, T(s)v_0) = 0$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, in particular, $F_0(0, v_0) = 0$. Finally, from Lemma 4.12 it follows that $\partial_u F_0(0, v_0)$ is an isomorphism from $U_0$ onto $U_0$. Hence, the classical implicit function theorem yields that the map $s \approx 0 \mapsto T(s)v_0 \in U_0$ is $C^\infty$-smooth, i.e., $v_0 \in U_l$ for all $l$. □

Now we represent the problem (1.5)–(1.7), i.e., the problem (4.6)–(4.8), in the setting of Section 2. Define

$$F : [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times U_0 \to U_0 : \ F(\lambda, v) := v - C(\lambda, v_0)v - D(\lambda, v, v_0).$$

Then, because of Lemma 4.7 and Corollary 4.13, the map

$$(s, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times U_0 \mapsto \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s, v) := T(s)F(\lambda, T(-s)v) \in U_0$$

is $C^\infty$-smooth for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$, i.e., the condition (2.3) is fulfilled. Moreover, it is easy to show that the conditions (2.4) and (2.5) are fulfilled. Further, Lemma 4.11 (i) yields (2.8). And finally, Lemmas 4.10, 4.12 and B.1 and Remark B.2 (with $U := U_0$) imply (2.9). Hence, applying Theorem 2.2 to the equation $v = C(\lambda, v_0)v + D(\lambda, v, v_0)$, we finish the proof of Theorem 4.1.

# A Appendix

In this appendix we present a simple linear version of the so-called fiber contraction principle (see, e.g., [6, Section 1.11.3]):

**Lemma A.1** *Let $U$ be a Banach space and $u_1, u_2, \ldots \in U$ a converging sequence. Further, let $A_1, A_2, \ldots \in \mathcal{L}(U)$ be a sequence of linear bounded operators on $U$ such that there exists $c < 1$ such that for all $u \in U$ it holds*

$$\|A_n u\| \le c\|u\| \text{ for all } n = 1, 2, \ldots \tag{A.1}$$

*and*

$$A_1 u, A_2 u, \ldots \text{ converges in } U. \tag{A.2}$$

*Finally, let $v_1, v_2, \ldots \in U$ be a sequence such that for all positive integers $n$ we have*

$$v_{n+1} = A_n v_n + u_n. \tag{A.3}$$

*Then the sequence $v_1, v_2, \ldots$ converges in $U$.*

**Proof.** Because of (A.2) there exists $A \in \mathcal{L}(U)$ such that for all $u \in U$ we have $A_n u \to Au$ in $U$ for $n \to \infty$. Moreover, (A.1) yields that $\|Au\| \le c\|u\|$ for all $u \in U$. Because of $c < 1$ there exists exactly one $v \in U$ such that $v = Av + u$, where $u \in U$ is the limit of the sequence $u_1, u_2, \ldots \in U$.

Let us show that $v_k \to v$ in $U$ for $k \to \infty$. Because of (A.3) we have

$$v_{n+1} - v = A_n(v_n - v) + (A_n - A)\, v + u_n - u. \tag{A.4}$$

Using the notation $r_n := \|v_n - v\|$ and $s_n := \|\,(A_n - A)\, v\| + \|u_n - u\|$, we get from (A.1) and (A.4)

$$r_{n+1} \le cr_n + s_n \le c^2 r_{n-1} + cs_{n-1} + s_n \le \ldots \le c^n r_1 + \sum_{m=0}^{n} c^{n-m} s_m. \tag{A.5}$$

Take $s_0 > 0$ such that $s_n \le s_0$ for all $n$. Then (A.5) implies for $0 \le l \le n$

$$r_{n+1} \le c^n \left( r_1 + s_0 \sum_{m=0}^{l} c^{-m} \right) + \frac{1}{1-c} \max_{l<m\le n} s_m. \tag{A.6}$$

But we have

$$\max_{l<m\le n} s_m \to 0 \text{ for } l \to \infty \text{ uniformly in } n, \tag{A.7}$$

and the assumption $c < 1$ implies

$$c^n \left( r_1 + s_0 \sum_{m=0}^{l} c^{-m} \right) \to 0 \text{ for } n \to \infty \text{ for any fixed } l. \tag{A.8}$$

Now (A.6)–(A.8) yield that $r_n \to 0$ for $n \to \infty$, which is the claim. □

# A Appendix

In this appendix we present an approach how to verify the assumptions (2.8) and (2.9) of Theorem 2.2. For similar approaches see [26, 31].

**Lemma B.1** *Let $(U, \|\cdot\|_U)$ and $(V, \|\cdot\|_V)$ be Banach spaces and $(H, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$ be a Hilbert space such that*

$$V \text{ is compactly embedded into } U \tag{B.1}$$

*and*

$$U \text{ is continuously embedded into } H. \tag{B.2}$$

*Further, let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, and for any $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ let $\mathcal{C}(\lambda), \mathcal{D}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{L}(U)$ be such that*

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0} \sup_{\|u\|_U \le 1} \langle (\mathcal{C}(\lambda) + \mathcal{D}(\lambda) - \mathcal{C}(0) - \mathcal{D}(0))\, u, h\rangle = 0 \text{ for all } h \in H. \tag{B.3}$$

*Finally, suppose that there exists $d > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$*

$$I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda) \text{ is bijective from } U \text{ to } U \text{ and } \left\|(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(U)} \leq d, \tag{B.4}$$

$$\|\mathcal{C}(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U)} + \|\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U)} \leq d, \tag{B.5}$$

*and*

$$\left((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1} \mathcal{D}(\lambda)\right)^2 u \in V, \ \left\|\left((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1} \mathcal{D}(\lambda)\right)^2 u\right\|_V \leq d\|u\|_U \text{ for all } u \in U. \tag{B.6}$$

*Then the following is true:*

*(i) $I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda) - \mathcal{D}(\lambda)$ is Fredholm of index zero from $U$ to $U$ for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$.*

*(ii) If $(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda) - \mathcal{D}(\lambda))\, u = 0$ for $u \in U$ and $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$, then $u \in V$.*

*(iii) If $I - \mathcal{C}(0) - \mathcal{D}(0)$ is injective, then there exist $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $c > 0$ such that $\|\,(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda) - \mathcal{D}(\lambda))\, u\|_U \geq c\|u\|_U$ for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1]$ and $u \in U$.*

**Proof.** Because of assumptions (B.4) and (B.6) the operator $((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda))^2$ is bounded from $U$ to $V$. Hence, assumption (B.1) yields that it is compact from $U$ to $U$. Therefore [16, Theorem XIII.5.2] implies that the operator $I - (I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda)$ is Fredholm of index zero from $U$ to $U$, i.e. Claim (i) is therewith proved.

To prove Claim (ii), take $u \in U$ with $(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda) - \mathcal{D}(\lambda))\, u = 0$. Then we have $u = ((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda))^2\, u$, and (B.6) yields $u \in V$, as desired.

To prove Claim (iii), suppose the contrary. Then there exist sequences $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $u_1, u_2, \ldots \in U$ with

$$\|u_n\|_U = 1 \tag{B.7}$$

and

$$|\lambda_n| + \|\,(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda_n) - \mathcal{D}(\lambda_n))\, u_n\|_U \to 0. \tag{B.8}$$

From (B.4), (B.5) and (B.8) it follows

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\left(I - \left((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda_n))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda_n)\right)^2\right) u_n\right\|_U \\
&= \left\|(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda_n))^{-1}(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda_n) + \mathcal{D}(\lambda_n))(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda_n))^{-1}\,(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda_n) - \mathcal{D}(\lambda_n))\, u_n\right\|_U \\
&\leq \text{ const } \|\,(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda_n) - \mathcal{D}(\lambda_n))\, u_n\|_U \to 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.9}$$

Moreover, because of (B.6) and(B.7) the sequence $((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda_n))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda_n))^2\, u_n$ is bounded in $V$. Hence, (B.1) yields that without loss of generality we can assume that it converges in $U$, i.e., that there exists $u_* \in U$ such that

$$\left\|\left(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda_n))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda_n)\right)^2 u_n - u_*\right\|_U \to 0.$$

Therefore, (B.9) implies

$$\|u_n - u_*\|_U \to 0. \tag{B.10}$$

On the other hand, from (B.3) and (B.7) we have

$$(\mathcal{C}(\lambda_n) + \mathcal{D}(\lambda_n) - \mathcal{C}(0) - \mathcal{D}(0))\, u_n \rightharpoonup 0 \text{ in } H.$$

Using (B.2) and (B.8), we get $(I - \mathcal{C}(0) - \mathcal{D}(0))u_n \rightharpoonup 0$ in $H$. Hence, (B.2) and (B.10) yield $(I - \mathcal{C}(0) - \mathcal{D}(0))u_* = 0$. But the operator $I - \mathcal{C}(0) - \mathcal{D}(0)$ is injective, hence $u_* = 0$. Therefore (B.10) contradicts to (B.7). $\square$

**Remark B.2** If $V$ is dense in $U$, then for (B.6) it is sufficient that there exists $d > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$

$$\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 v, \mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v \in V \text{ and } \|\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 v\|_V + \|\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)v\|_V \le d\|v\|_U \text{ for all } v \in V. \quad \text{(B.11)}$$

Indeed, take $u \in U$. Then there exists a sequence $v_1, v_2, \ldots \in V$ such that $\|v_n - u\|_U \to 0$. Because of (B.4), (B.5) and (B.11), the sequence

$$\left((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\right)^2 v_n = (I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\left(\mathcal{D}(\lambda)^2 + \mathcal{D}(\lambda)\mathcal{C}(\lambda)(I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\right) v_n \quad \text{(B.12)}$$

is fundamental in $V$. Hence, there exists $v_* \in V$ such that

$$\left\| \left((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\right)^2 v_n - v_* \right\|_V \to 0.$$

On the other hand, the sequence $\left((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\right)^2 v_n$ tends to $\left((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\right)^2 u$ in $U$, i.e. $\left((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\right)^2 u = v_*$. Using (B.4), (B.5), (B.11) and (B.12) again we get

$$\begin{aligned} \| \left((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\right)^2 u\|_V &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \| \left((I - \mathcal{C}(\lambda))^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\lambda)\right)^2 v_n\|_V \\ &\le \text{const } \lim_{n\to\infty} \|v_n\|_U = \text{const } \|u\|_U. \end{aligned}$$

# References


[1] R. Abraham, J. E. Marsden, T. Ratiu, *Manifolds, Tensor Analysis, and Applications,* Appl. Math. Sciences **75**, Springer, 1988.

[2] H. Amann, J. Escher, *Analysis II,* Birkhäuser, 2008.

[3] J. Appell, A. S. Kalitvin, P. P. Zabrejko, *Partial Integral Operators and Integro-Differential Equations,* Pure Appl. Math. **230**, Marcel Dekker, 2000.

[4] J. Appell, A. Vignoli, P. P. Zabrejko, Implicit function theorems and nonlinear integral equations, *Expo. Math.* **14** (1996), 384-424.

[5] M. Berti, M. Procesi, Quasi-periodic solutions of completely resonant forced wave equations, *Commun. Partial Differ. Equations* **35** (2005), 959-985.

[6] C. Chicone, *Ordinary Differential Equatins with Applications*, second ed., Texts in Appl. Math. **34**, Springer, 2006.

[7] W. Craig, A bifurcation theory for periodic solutions of nonlinear dissipative hyperbolic equations, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa, Cl. Sci., IV. Ser.* **10** (1983), 125-167.

[8] E. N. Dancer, The $G$-invariant implicit function theorem in infinite dimensions II, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh* **A102** (1986), 211-220.

[9] J. Dieudonne, *Foundations of Modern Analysis*, Academic Press, 1960.

[10] P. C. Fife, Boundary and interior transition layer phenomena for pairs of second-order differential operators, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **54** (1976), 497-521.

[11] P. C. Fife, W. M. Greenlee, Transition layers for elliptic boundary value problems with small parameters, *Uspechi Mat. Nauk* **24** (1974), 103-130.

[12] J. A. Griepentrog, L. Recke, Local existence, uniqueness, and smooth dependence for nonsmooth quasilinear parabolic problems, *J. Evolution Equations* **10** (2010), 341-375.

[13] K. Gröger, L. Recke, Applications of differential calculus to quasilinear elliptic boundary value problems with non-smooth data, *Nonlinear Differ. Equations Appl. (NoDEA)* **13** (2006), 263-285.

[14] J. K. Hale, G. Raugel, A modified Poincare method for the persistence of periodic orbits and applications, *J. Dyn. Diff. Equat.* **22** (2010), 3-68.

[15] J. K. Hale, G. Raugel, Persistence of periodic orbits for perturbed dissipative dynamical systems, In: *Infinite Dimensional Dynamical Systems,* ed. by J. Mallet-Paret et al., Fields Institute Communications **64**, Springer, 2013, 1-55.

[16] L. V. Kantorovich, G. P. Akilov, *Functional Analysis,* second ed., Pergamon Press, 1982

[17] I. Kmit, Smoothing effect and Fredholm property for first order hyperbolic PDEs, in *Pseudo-differential operators, generalized functions and asymptotics*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications **231** (Birkhäuser, 2013), pp. 219-238.

[18] I. Kmit, L. Recke, Fredholm alternative for periodic-Dirichlet problems for linear hyperbolic systems, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **335** (2007), 355–370.

[19] I. Kmit, L. Recke, Fredholmness and smooth dependence for linear hyperbolic periodic-Dirichlet problems, *J. Differ. Equations* **252** (2012), 1962-1986.

[20] I. Kmit, L. Recke, Time-periodic second-order hyperbolic equations: Fredholm solvability, regularity, and smooth dependence. Accepted for publication in *Pseudo-Differential Operators, Generalized Functions*. Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, Basel: Birkhäuser (2014), 35 pages.

[21] I. Kmit, L. Recke, Periodic solutions to dissipative hyperbolic systems. I: Fredholm solvability of linear problems, Preprint 999 (2013), DFG Research Center Matheon.

[22] I. Kmit and L. Recke, Hopf bifurcation for semilinear dissipative hyperbolic systems, *J. Differ. Equations* **257** (2014) 264–309.

[23] I. Kmit, L. Recke, Solution regularity and smooth dependence for abstract equivariant equations and applications to autonomous hyperbolic PDEs. In preparation.

[24] A. Yu. Kolesov, N. Kh. Rozov, Parametric excitation of high-mode oscillations for a nonlinear telegraph equation, *Mat. Sb.* **191** (2000), 45-68.

[25] M. Lichtner, M. Radziunas, L. Recke, Well-posedness, smooth dependence and center manifold reduction for a semilinear hyperbolic system from laser dynamics, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* 30 (2007), 931-960.

[26] R. Magnus, The implicit function theorem and multi-bumb solutions of periodic partial differential equations, *Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh* **136A** (2006), 559–583.

[27] L. Pavel, Classical solutions in Sobolev spaces for a class of hyperbolic Lotka-Volterra systems, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **51** (2013), 2132–2151.

[28] M. Radziunas, Numerical bifurcation analysis of traveling wave model of multisection semiconductor lasers, *Physica D* **213** (2006), 575–613.

[29] M. Radziunas, H.-J. Wünsche, Dynamics of multisection DFB semiconductor lasers: traveling wave and mode approximation models, *In: Optoelectronic Devices–Advanced Simulation and Analysis*, ed. by J. Piprek, Springer, 2005, 121–150.

[30] P. H. Rabinowitz, Periodic solutions of nonlinear hyperbolic partial differential equations. II, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **22** (1969), 15-39.

[31] L. Recke, O. Omel'chenko, Boundary layer solutions to problems with infinite dimensional singular and regular perturbations, *J. Differ. Equations* **245 (12)** (2008), 3806–3822.

[32] M. Renardy, Bifurcation from rotating waves, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **79** (1982), 49–84.

[33] J. Sieber, Numerical bifurcation analysis for multisection semiconductor lasers, *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.* **1**, 248-270.

[34] M. Štědrý, Small time periodic solutions of fully nonlinear telegraph equations in more spatial dimensions, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré* **6** (1989), 209-232.